

THE MODERN REVIEW

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE.

"INQUE BREVI SPATIO MUTANTUR SÆCLA ANIMANTUM
"ET QUASI CUSORES VITAE LAMPADA TRADUNT."

LUCRETIVS.

VOL. V.—1884.

London:

JAMES CLARKE & CO., 13 & 14, FLEET STREET.

MANCHESTER: JOHN HEYWOOD.

AGENT FOR THE UNITED STATES: GEORGE H. ELLIS, BOSTON.

1884.

No index ever sent.

THE MODERN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1884.

THROUGH THE PROPHETS TO THE LAW.

THE Hebrew prophets, as has been already shown in the last number of this Review,* stood before their people as the interpreters of Yahveh's demands for national righteousness. They expounded the destinies of Israel as the chosen people, the depository of the only saving truths of religion: they confronted the realities of its misconduct with the requirements of its ideal function: they unfolded the secret of its sufferings; they promised its final triumph when purified by pain. They were the critics of the present; they were the heralds of the future: had they no word to say about the past?

It is with a true instinct that the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament reckons among "the prophets" the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. These books tell the story of Israel's life in Canaan. The conquest, the settlement, the slow evolution of a new social order, the rise of the monarchy, the birth of prophetism, the glories of David and Solomon, the disruption, the fortunes of the two kingdoms till both were overthrown,—these are their themes. The materials are drawn from various sources; but (with the exception of certain sections

* *Modern Review*, October, 1883. "The Prophets of the Old Testament," by J. Frederick Smith.

in Joshua which relate the conquest from the Levitical point of view) they are all fused together in the light of great prophetic ideas. Time after time the writers show us that they are not only narrating events, but also weaving them into a chain of cause and effect. The principles of judgment which they adopt for this purpose, are those of the higher Yahvism revealed to us at the close of the monarchy in the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The standard thus attained is carried back through the earlier periods of the history, and the result is a frequent distortion of their true meaning. The lofty monotheism of the prophets is attributed to Joshua, and for a brief season the people are faithful to their divine Lord. Then follow seasons of apostasy with occasional paroxysms of repentance. The reign of David had stamped itself too strongly in the popular heart not to be regarded as a time of national piety; the erection of the temple was a pledge of the devout intentions of the youthful Solomon; and here and there along the line of kings gleamed out some flash of loyalty under a Hezekiah or a Josiah. But on the whole the historians adopt that view of their nation's past which is indicated, for example, in the following words of Jeremiah:—

I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people, and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you that it may be well unto you. But they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked in the counsels and the stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward. Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt, I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them, yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear, but hardened their neck, they did worse than their fathers (*Jer. vii., 22—26*; cp. *Ezek. xxiii.*).

The prophetic books of the history, therefore, contain one long indictment: their story is a story of religious decline which the noblest of national leaders were unable to arrest: they offer, in their record of the popular unfaithfulness, the vindication of Yahveh's awful righteous-

ness in the ruin of his people. But they never forget that they are dealing with a nation. Nationality and religion are blended, but the idea of nationality is never lost. The monarchy is divided, but the national name Israel belongs to the Northern state: Israel has its prophets, its religious revolutions, as well as Judah: it is, indeed, loaded at the outset with the fatal burden of the "sin of Jeroboam who made Israel to sin," but it is not out of the pale of Yahvism: the same opportunities are open to the one kingdom as to the other: the same doom alights on both, for the same crimes have been committed by both.

There is, however, another version of the history of the monarchy, which presents it under a quite different aspect. The books of Chronicles are not reckoned among the prophetic books: they are placed in the third division of the Hebrew canon, entitled the "Writings," and they are well known to be of much later origin than the books of Kings. A glance at these books reveals at once a very different order of conceptions. The same method of interpreting history is indeed pursued. A religious test is adopted, and every calamity is the direct consequence of guilt. But what is the test? It is one that is nowhere applied throughout the earlier narratives. They were founded on the prophetic monotheism. The standard of the Chronicles, on the other hand, is the Levitical Law. Their representation of the history is not national, it is ecclesiastical. The true Israel is a Church, and not a State. Hence, the historical Israel, the northern kingdom, is founded in schism; its origin lies not so much in political rebellion as in religious apostasy; and it must, consequently, be thrust out of view. For already under David the splendours of the Levitical organisation shone forth in full glory, and with the erection of the Temple under Solomon, its institutions were permanently established. But of all this the books of Kings say nothing.* The elaborate arrangements

* The analysis of 1 Kings viii. 1—4, and comparison with the Septuagint, reveal how the text has been manipulated under later Levitical influences: cp. Bleek—Wellhausen, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. § 122.

of David are passed over in absolute silence. How is it that the Chronicler only is acquainted with them, and why does he alone elevate them into the high rank of principles of divine government? The answer is ready: The Chronicler saw in his own day the fully developed system of Levitical worship. It was founded on the book of the Law of Moses, and as such it could not be imagined that the piety of antiquity had failed to carry it out. But the existing records of the past omitted all reference to it. This deficiency, therefore, must be supplied: and starting from the supposed Mosaic origin and the perpetual validity of the law, the Chronicler proceeded to correct the older tradition, and, as he no doubt imagined, to interpret it more faithfully, by carrying back to the first days of Jerusalem under David and Solomon the full Levitical ritual in the forms elaborated by the time of Alexander the Great. The religious organisation of the kingdom of Judah, depicted in the Chronicles, is simply the Jewish community of the Perso-Greek age, transported into the past. The Chronicler supposes that he is writing history, and so he is: but it is the history of the temple-service of his own age as it had grown out of the ordinances of the completed Torah.

If the prophetic presentation of the history contains nothing about the Levitical institutions, it is not surprising that the prophetic presentation of the Law should be equally silent. The oldest legislation, in the First Code,* is almost wholly civil. It makes no provision for a priesthood: it lays down only the outlines of a cultus, and it is throughout engaged with the human relations of the people to each other, rather than with their divine obligations as the chosen of Yahveh. The Deuteronomic code marks a considerable advance: the conception of Israel and of its special election by Yahveh has assumed a clearer form: but its legislation is concerned, as Spinoza remarked two centuries since, with a civil polity. At the head of the nation stands the king: over each district, guiding the affairs of town and village, are the presiding elders. It is

* *Modern Review*, April, 1883, "The Book of Deuteronomy," p. 258 sqq.

true that the great aim of the book is a religious aim, and that for this purpose it must effect a reform of the popular worship. Its main object is to secure the complete devotion of the nation to Yahveh. But it does not contemplate the nation solely as a community for worship. Israel is a state, surrounded by other states; it is settled in a beautiful and fertile country; it is composed of families knit together by tender ties, of parents and children, rich and poor, righteous and unjust together; it is nourished by agriculture, it must prepare for war; it has a social life, independent of the sanctuary; and though it is not without ritual and sacred officers, it does not exist for the sake of the ritual. It is, in short, a State and not a Church.

But in the Priestly Codex the view suddenly changes. The king has disappeared, and from the sanctuary issues the high priest, already raised to such a representative eminence that his death makes an era, from which the years begin anew. The elders have vanished, and though certain shadowy forms known as the "princes" loom through the haze, these have no clear place in the organisation of the people. The nation is transformed into the "congregation": the civil order seems absorbed in the ecclesiastical. The "dwelling-place" planted in the midst of the camp, with the Priests and Levites encircling it, and the rest of the tribes disposed in order on its four sides, is but the symbol of the new idea by which the whole of existence is to be subject to divine control. The entire ancient polity is enmeshed in an intricate net-work of ceremonial observances. And these are all instituted by direct revelation. The festival calendar, once the natural expression of the gladness of the seasons, is promulgated now from the Holy of Holies, at the supreme will of the Most High. The sacrifices are regulated by decrees from heaven, and the minutest details are not thought unworthy of dictation by the Creator of the world. For each event of life from birth to death the appropriate observance is provided: and so the whole being of the nation becomes a vast perpetual service, the emblems of which are seen in

daily offerings, and the ever-burning fire, and the supremacy of the consecrated caste. It is plain, then, that this scheme everywhere assumes the prior existence of a civil administration. It is inconceivable that it could have been the creation of the desert. Its complicated system of priestly revenues is alone enough to show that an established social order lies beneath it. The ecclesiastical institutions of the Levitical Legislation, it has been well said, as inevitably presuppose the traditions and methods of a State, as the Roman Church presupposes the organisation of the Roman Empire.*

The latest criticism of the Pentateuch does not hesitate, on purely critical grounds, to declare this the last and final application of positive enactment to religion. But the critical results must have an inner meaning: they must be capable of explanation by the course of events and the changing forms of thought produced out of the play of faith upon the facts of life. If there is this contrast between the prophetic and the priestly views of Israel's history, between the prophetic and the priestly codes of Israel's legislation, can we trace the influences which evolved the later out of the earlier, can we follow the steps between what we may broadly call the Prophets and the Law, and find their true relation to each other?

I.

Every religion has its own idiom. It creates a sacred dialect in which it expresses its ideas concerning the relations of man and God. It takes hold of words and groups of words, secludes them perhaps from their common use, and infuses into them a meaning of its own. Each term or set of terms, thus represents some thought or feeling, and the language so consecrated tends to pass through various

* Cp. Smend's essay, "Ueber die Genesis des Judenthums," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1882, p. 101 sq.; I am indebted for many thoughts to this interesting, though it must be added prolix, article.

modifications of meaning as it is applied to successive modifications of the conceptions for which it is employed.

Such a set of terms is found in the group of words belonging to Hebrew, Canaanite, Phenician, and Assyrian religion, whose essential idea we indicate by the word "holy." This is, in particular, a keyword to Israel's thought: it belongs to Prophets and to Law alike.* The range of objects to which it may be applied extends from the humblest consecrated gift to the throne of heaven, nay, to its great occupant, Yahveh himself. The primitive notion attached to its root is believed to be that of cutting off, parting, dividing, separating. But this notion has been limited to the sphere of religion: a piece of furniture, a robe, a plot of ground, a given day, are only holy in so far as they are withdrawn from common use, and dedicated to Yahveh. Thus holiness is not an intrinsic quality; it does not attach to things inherently; nothing possesses holiness in and for itself; it is something conferred upon it by the religious relation in which it is placed. Even when it is applied to Yahveh, it does not seem to have had originally any specific significance or particular moral contents such as we now associate with it. Yahveh is holy in virtue of that quality or series of qualities in the divine nature which mark him off from all other beings. The only beings who could in any way be brought into contrast or competition with him were the inhabitants of the earth, and the false gods which they worship. Thus Hosea declares of Yahveh, xi. 9:—

I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not again destroy Ephraim, for I am God, and not man, the Holy One in the midst of thee.

Here the holiness of Yahveh is equivalent to his deity; it is the supreme expression of all that lifts him above his mortal creatures. As he is thus marked off from man,

* See the exhaustive essay of Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religions-Geschichte*, Heft ii., Leipzig, 1878.

8 *THROUGH THE PROPHETS TO THE LAW.*

so he is also distinguished from every other god, and Ezekiel accordingly affirms in his name, xxxix. 7,—

So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel, and I will not let them pollute my holy name any more and the heathen shall know that I am Yahveh, the Holy One of Israel!

So through the word holy there is discerned now the shining radiance of the divine glory, now the majestic splendour of his universal might, now the solemnity of his inviolable sanctity. The divine transcendence manifests itself especially in its elevation above all defilement, pollution, sin: and hence the holiness of Yahveh is especially apparent in the awful purity of his eternal righteousness.

Intermediate, however, between the holy things and the holy God—between the land and its temple-mountain, its feasts and sacrifices, vestments and offerings, on the one hand, and the court of heaven with its dread tribunal and its sublime judge, on the other,—stands the nation whom Yahveh has chosen and seeks to mould to his will. In what sense is Israel holy, and by what means is that holiness to be realised? The answers to this question along the line of Israel's religious history will perhaps give us the clue which we seek to the true relation of the Prophets and the Law.

II.

We shall not be wrong in looking for our first reply to the oldest elements of the Pentateuch, to the earliest form of its tradition, and the ordinances of the First Code. Here we find at once the two notes of Prophecy and Law. The people have passed the Red Sea, they are encamped before the mount, and Moses ascends to receive the divine commands.

And Yahveh called to him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob and tell the children of Israel, ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all peoples: for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation (*Ex. xix. 3—6*).

It is to be observed here that Israel's holiness is represented not as a present condition, but as a future promise. It is not its actual state, it is its future destiny. But what is its significance? It is simply a declaration that Israel shall be Yahveh's property. Out of the whole earth he will choose this one people, and by that act he will withdraw it from all other nations and set it apart as his own. That state of detachment, that appropriation to him alone, will be holiness. Yahveh and Israel will stand to each other in a relation to which no one else will be admitted. It is a relation which shall hereafter be constituted, and it can rest on one foundation only, Israel's obedience, its adherence to the terms of the covenant by which Yahveh would keep them separate from the nations of the world.

This covenant of course implied that worship should be paid to Yahveh alone; and inasmuch as the only known form of worship was ritual, the arrangements for worship in the First Code assume this form. The worship of other gods is strictly prohibited; idolatry likewise is forbidden; but the believer's approach to Yahveh by the usual methods of sacrifice is not limited to one place; the choice is free, the altar may be reared on any spot without restriction; the gift may be given anywhere, and the divine blessing will follow. This was the custom of primitive Yahvism, and the history of Israel shows us the whole land covered with local sanctuaries, by means of which constant expression was given to the relation between the people and its God. That relation of holiness, which the prophetic narrator, standing in imagination at its cradle among the peaks of Sinai, describes as something yet to grow and be, the legislator can only conceive as already established. The very act by which Yahveh lays his commands on Israel and on none other, implies that they are already his: they are the chosen objects of his favour: and with the privilege comes also the responsibility. Already adopted as Yahveh's property, they must behave as becomes this lofty ownership: and accordingly the legislative code demands of Israel the conduct conformable to holiness. But what is that

10 *THROUGH THE PROPHETS TO THE LAW.*

conduct? The only requirement which the code formulates is this :

Ye shall be holy men unto me, and flesh in the field that is torn of beasts ye shall not eat : ye shall cast it unto the dogs (*Ex. xxii. 31*).

Such carcases were regarded as defiled : among the "men of holiness," the men who belonged to Yahveh, nothing polluting must enter : even their very food must be clean. Here is the first faint note of what is afterwards to become the full chorus of Levitical demands. The arrangements of the First Code represent an early stage of popular Yahvism, under the influence of ideas which by way of contrast we call Prophetic. Monotheism is not defined, but it is trembling into full consciousness ; monolatry is enjoined, and idol-worship repudiated. The First Code thus endeavours to give practical shape to the higher teaching spreading among the prophets—Elijah and Elisha led the contest for Yahveh against the Baal, but they directed no polemic against the calves of Yahveh or the high-places—and may be taken to represent the general aim of religion at the beginning of the eighth century B.C. Under what influences was the next step in advance to be taken ?

III.

A glance at the history of Yahvism under the monarchy reveals to us at once a most important fact. It was the national religion of both kingdoms, of the north as well as the south. Its vigour in Ephraim cannot be disputed. It produced an order of prophets whose leaders took the destinies of the nation into their hands, and threw down and set up kings. It gave expression to the national view of its history in collections of the traditions of the past from the patriarchal period onwards ; it uttered the national aspirations in poems such as the Blessing of Moses, where the high-place assigned to the tribe of Levi shows already the growth of the sacred order and its importance in the life of the people. It had plenty of sanctuaries, it had powerful

priesthoods. Through the mouth of Hosea it proclaimed the first anticipations of the Gospel in the delineation of the love of Yahveh for his erring child. But it was doomed to disappear. It fell with the fall of Samaria, and was extinguished by the Assyrian invasion. The deported captives struggled for a time to maintain it in their foreign homes. But it had no vitality to maintain its life. It lost its independence, it languished and died, so that among the multitude of religions of the great Mesopotamian empire no trace of it remained, while the feeble effort made to revive it on its native soil had no permanent success.

By-and-by it was the turn of Jerusalem. The Chaldeans grasped the power which Assyria could no longer hold. Once more must Judah suffer as the collision between the mighty forces of the Euphrates and the Nile approached. The same doom fell upon the city of David which had overtaken its younger rival. The same fate threatened the religion of the southern as of the northern state. But instead of succumbing to decay and dissolution it arose with a new might: that which seemed to threaten it with complete destruction proved instead the necessary condition of its purification. Had Jerusalem fallen a hundred and twenty years before under Sennacherib, who can tell what might have been the result? The Yahvism of Isaiah might then have shared the fate of the sister faith of Hosea. Can we in any way account for the different spiritual issues of similar outward events; and can we trace their bearings on the problem we have in hand?

IV.

The survival of Yahvism after the fall of Judah must have been due to the superior moral and religious forces which played through it upon the national life. The first and most obvious of these is the development of prophetism. The prophecy of the eighth century, as the organ of the higher Yahvism, necessarily threw itself into the conflict

with the popular heathenism which surrounded it on every hand. It protested against every intrusion of impure Canaanite cultus into the true worship, and while feeling its way towards articulate expression of those truths of the sole deity and absolute dominion of Yahveh which it had already implicitly grasped, it denounced every species of idolatry whether practised in his rival's name or in his own. It called for reform, but it expected that reform to be divinely wrought. That Israel must realise its destiny, and rise to the height of its calling as Yahveh's holy people, it was confident. But the actual Israel could not do this, and the prophetic delineations of its state show us why not. Prophetism, therefore, applying the fundamental principles of Yahveh's righteousness to the condition of the nation which claimed to be his, could see only one way of lifting Israel to the ideal elevation on which it ought to stand. Chastisement first, then purification, was the invariable order of its thought. In Isaiah's day, when the Assyrian power loomed larger and larger, as one after another of the Syrian kingdoms fell into its hands, it was to this that the prophet's eyes turned with a strange mingling of stern warning and triumphant hope. From the outset of his ministry this seemed to have been the message committed to him: invasion must sweep through the land; captivity and suffering must do their cleansing work upon the people; but though the tree should be cut down to its very roots, there was yet within it a promise of renewed life. How did this harmonise with the idea of the holy people? It was the first step to its true embodiment in a living community which had hitherto failed to give it actual being.

When Yahveh shall have removed men afar off, and the deserted space shall be large in the midst of the land, should there yet be a tenth, this again shall be exterminated, as the terebinth and the oak, of which, after felling, a stock remaineth, a holy seed is the stock thereof (*Is. vi. 13*).

What is this "holy seed"? The passage does not clearly determine for us. It may mean nothing more than a seed dedicated to Yahveh, and so inviolable and secure; but else-

where the high significance of the promise appears much more plain.

It shall come to pass, he who is left in Zion and remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, every one who is written down for life in Jerusalem, when Yahveh shall have washed off the filth of the daughters of Zion, and cleansed the blood of Jerusalem in her midst, by a blast of judgment, and a blast of extermination (*Is. iv. 3, 4*).

Here it is plain that holiness implies something much more than a mere relation of property between Yahveh as owner, and Israel as owned. It is the condition of those who have been purified by a "blast of judgment," which would exterminate all guilty idolatries and every species of falsehood and oppression, and fit the survivors to enter the higher life of the redeemed people. We know what glowing pictures Isaiah drew of the future for his nation, thus initiated by the Assyrian invasions; how near it seemed to him; what marvellous harmony should pervade all nature; what gracious justice should adorn the throne; what peace should spread among the nations; what majestic supremacy should belong to Israel. The Assyrians did indeed come, and though Samaria fell, Jerusalem was saved. But the reign of righteousness did not set in. The monarchy was established with greater solidity than ever. The dynasty of David received a new lease of power, but not the sevenfold spirit (*Is. xi. 2*); the people were not purified by danger and loss; and the issue of the conflict, though it may have strengthened the hands of the reforming party for a little while, was soon lost. The great prophetic ideal of a regenerated people made holy to Yahveh was cut off from the fulfilment that had seemed so near, and must wait for some fresh crisis in the nation's destinies.

V.

Hezekiah passed away, and Manasseh proved in every way the exact opposite to the prince whose advent Isaiah had celebrated in such lofty strains. The very existence of Yahvism was in danger. Foreign usages of every description were poured into the country, became fashionable at

Jerusalem, and invaded even the very temple itself. Remonstrance and resistance were met by the simple plea of force. Those who sought to vindicate the purity of the national religion paid for their boldness by their lives. For a whole generation idolatrous licence ran riot, and the struggle of the faithful was at the cost of blood and death. It was the first of that long series of martyr ages through which Israel's religion was to be tested and welded into an iron strength. Under such circumstances prophetism could not remain abstract and ideal. In the preceding century it had looked to Yahveh to work upon the people the necessary change; it had proposed no definite scheme of reform; it had relied on the operation of the divine powers by which it felt itself supported. But now that the reign of Manasseh had proved that their interference was postponed, or perhaps withheld altogether, it remained to be seen what other means could be found for bringing the real Israel, as the people of Yahveh, into nearer conformity with its ideal calling. Prophetism in short was compelled to address itself to certain concrete objects, as the methods of compassing its ultimate ends. The first of these objects was the separation of the religion of Yahveh from every element—foreign or native—impairing its purity. And inasmuch as all the functions of religion then were ritual, this aim necessarily took the shape of a reform of the cultus. It was one of the conditions inherent in the development of Israel's religion that it could not yet be dissociated from the public offices of sacrifice and festival. These had belonged to it from its first days. As long as religion was the bond of nationality, it inevitably expressed itself by this agency, and the task which prophetism saw immediately before it was to secure right worship as the necessary condition of true religion, the natural and inseparable sign of the right relation to Yahveh. Cast out every Canaanite abomination, destroy every idol, throw down every altar, abolish every sanctuary where the proper rites cannot be guaranteed against corruption, and let the whole nation pay its devotions in the one place which Yahveh himself has chosen:—this was the programme of the Deuteronomic code.

That code was as much the product of the prophetic spirit as the most high-wrought of Isaiah's pictures of the future. But it was the practical instead of the poetic side of prophecy. It was prophetism compelled by stress of events to make itself felt as a reforming energy: it was prophetism applied to the actual circumstances and existing requirements of religion. So it happened that prophetism entered the field of law, and clothed itself with prescriptions and ordinances designed to embody the principles of Israel's relation to Yahveh. That relation, as we have seen, was technically designated holiness. In the hands of a prophet like Isaiah, attention was fixed on its future aspects, and hence on the moral conditions under which it could be realised. But when it was approached from the side of tradition, it could not be regarded as something to be thereafter constituted. The choice of Israel by Yahveh had taken place long ago. That act of divine love which had fixed so strangely on a people superior neither in numbers nor in righteousness to other nations, was no new thing. Since his childhood in Egypt, Israel had been elect; ever since the covenant in Sinai it had been the peculiar depository of the knowledge and grace of Yahveh. Hence the prophetic legislators cannot treat holiness as a condition to be subsequently attained under the divine reconstruction of society; it is a relation already established, resulting from a resolve of heaven never since rescinded, and endowed with permanent force by the settlement of the chosen people in Yahveh's own land. On this ground it is that Yahveh has a right to impose on them his law, and regulate the worship by which he is to be approached. This is throughout the principle of the Deuteronomic reformers. When they call out for the destruction of all the local sanctuaries, when they cry, "Break the *maççebhas*, burn the *Ashêras*," what is the thought behind it?

Thou art a holy people to Yahveh thy God; Yahveh thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth (*Deut. vii. 6*).

Here, as in the First Code, the condition implied by holiness is a present fact ; it is not a state to be manifested in the future, it exists already. Out of it flow of necessity certain requirements of conduct. No member of Yahveh's Israel may practise any rite impairing that relation. In other words, not only abstinence from idolatry, but positive hostility towards it, is Israel's first duty. The injunctions for the overthrow of the local sanctuaries are thus the direct translation of the ideal demands of prophecy into the circumstances of village life. So, too, is the following passage, in which the common Canaanite usages of mourning for the dead are forbidden :—

Ye are sons to Yahveh your God ; ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead, for thou art an holy people to Yahveh thy God, and Yahveh hath chesen thee to be a peculiar people to himself, out of all the nations that are upon the earth (*Deut. xiv. 1, 2*).

Does this seem a trifling result of a relation so august ? Nothing could be of small account in the great issue between true God and false, nothing too minute to be included in the protection designed for Israel's religion, and so for Israel's highest welfare, by the new code. But this was not all ; for Yahveh claimed nothing less than the whole moral and spiritual energies of his people :—

And now, Israel, what doth Yahveh require of thee but to fear Yahveh thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve Yahveh thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, to keep the commandments of Yahveh and his statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good ? (*Deut. x. 12, 13*).

Holiness, the condition of belonging to Yahveh, cannot be maintained without righteousness ; not even the true worship can express it wholly ; it is further realised through the mind of faithfulness and the heart of love ; and so the ritual prescriptions glow with a passionate loyalty]which proves how powerful might be the infusion of the prophetic spirit into the forms of law.

VI.

Thus, then, the Law, as soon as it could acquire any creative force apart from the tradition on which it had hitherto depended, endeavoured to give actual shape to the prophetic ideal. In doing so it imparted to the conception of Israel's holiness a two-fold character, on the one side touching the cultus, on the other, conduct. Yet both sprang from the same root, the notion of separation from the rest of the world, and of choice by Yahveh as his special property. How far did these two tendencies compete with each other, and which ultimately triumphed?

In laying down the connection of Yahveh and Israel as one of mutual love, the Deuteronomic writers were in reality preparing the way for the ultimate severance of religion from the national cultus. But this goal could not be immediately perceived, and a sudden and unexpected blow seemed for the time to arrest all hope. The triumph of the Deuteronomic code was but brief, for a great disaster appeared to cut across all the Israelite notions of Providence. The early death of Josiah on the battle-field of Megiddo gave a terrible shock to the anticipations of the party of reform. "Obey my commandments," they had cried in the name of Yahveh, "and your days shall be long in the land;" prosperity should follow piety, and the faithful should live secure. Josiah had merited a happy life, and an honoured age: but in the prime of his manhood he sank into a premature grave of calamity and defeat. The subsequent writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel show how soon the work which he had promoted was undone. Idolatry reappeared with amazing swiftness; the Baal and Ashêra cultus was everywhere revived; the sanctuary at Jerusalem, which had been so laboriously cleansed, was again polluted. The reform had failed: the task of weaning Judah from the worship of other gods had all to be accomplished over again.

The relapse proved only too clearly how powerless the nation was to realise the conception developed by the

prophets of the higher Yahvism. It forced on Jeremiah the dreadful conviction that the real spiritualisation of religion could only come about in one way. On its own soil it could not be liberated from the heathen elements which clung to it. Then, it must be uprooted from the soil. Jerusalem must fall; and the nation must learn in exile the awful sternness of the divine judgment upon its sin. For more than twenty years he proclaimed this message to an indifferent or hostile people. Of the inward anguish which it cost him, his writings bear ample trace. As the Chaldean power drew nearer and nearer, he pointed to it in the plainest language as the instrument of Yahveh's avenging doom. So high is his sense of Yahveh's universal might, so clear his vision of the necessity of Yahveh's chastisement, that he does not hesitate to describe him as employing the King of Babylon as the "servant" who executes his designs. When the popular party cried aloud that the city was safe, for it held Yahveh's house, inviolable upon its sacred mount, Jeremiah replied that Yahveh needed no house, and asked why he should not do at Jerusalem what he had done at Shiloh? In the tradition of the wanderings the older imagination represented Yahveh as restrained from punishing his people as they deserved by the thought of the evil things which would be said about him by the Egyptians; the destruction of the people in the wilderness would be regarded as failure in his self-imposed task of guiding them to the promised land. No such thoughts now rise in the prophet's mind. He is indifferent to Yahveh's reputation: he cares not how the nations around may interpret the fall of the sanctuary. He is dominated by one word only, righteousness. The people that has resisted repeated warnings, and rebelled against the discipline of all its years, must perish. Yet at the same time he soars to the boldest hopes. As the Deuteronomists had represented the essence of the relation of Israel and Yahveh as mutual love, and as love with all the joyous obedience that sprang from it could live in no national heart, but only in each individual breast, the first steps had been taken towards the detachment of religion

from outward observance, and its transference to the conscience and the affections. That change was further aided by the deepening sense of sin, which thrills through the pages of Jeremiah, not only as national guilt, but as personal. From these two elements rose a new view of religion, which placed it in the fellowship of the inner mind with its divine Lord, and formulated itself in the prediction of a new covenant, where all should know Yahveh from the greatest to the least (*Jer.* xxxi. 31—34). This was in the future, the prophetic ideal. But the people could not reach it then and there. Long and weary must be the stages of their education; and the significant stress which Jeremiah lays upon the sabbath (xvii. 19—27), and the high promises which he links to its observance, show how he, too, perceived that practical reform, obedience to the organisation of Yahvism, must precede the highest spiritual attainments; the prophetic impulse must pass into daily life and animate the accepted institutions of religious order.

VII.

Jerusalem fell, but it did not fall without warning. The overthrow of the nation seemed at first as the stroke of death; the dispersal of the people like the scattering of its bones upon the desert plain. But the dissolution of the polity of Judah set free some seed of life, and the exile carried within it the promise of a higher future. Many elements prepared the way for this. The Deuteronomic code had striven to effect the absolute separation of Yahveh's people from everything idolatrous. That had, for a time at least, possessed the force of sacred law. Events had now confirmed its principles with awful distinctness. Disloyalty to that principle, the attempt to combine the worship of other gods with that of Yahveh, the attempt to combine within the worship of Yahveh the lower forms of idolatry with the higher and the only true, had brought about the predicted result. The Deuteronomic code, therefore, acquired, partly by its solemn adoption under Josiah, and

partly by subsequent occurrences, the character of a scripture, embodying a rule of right conduct, a declaration of the way of salvation. Moreover, the political fate of Judah had a peculiar meaning to the true believers. The success of Nebuchadnezzar might be viewed, and indeed was viewed by some, as a demonstration of the impotence of Yahveh, so that many went over to heathenism, and abandoned his service altogether. But there were others who saw in it that which Jeremiah had prepared them to see—the manifestation of his avenging might. The fall of Jerusalem was the triumph of Jeremiah. This personal vindication he could well have foregone: but the vindication of his preaching could not but be profoundly impressive to all who came within its influence. Those among the exiles, therefore, who retained their religion at all, held to it under a deep sense of inward guilt. The careless apathy or the unconcealed opposition of many might call forth Ezekiel's denunciations, but there was a small kernel who learned from the prophetic leaders how to interpret the significance of the catastrophe, and what direction effort must take for the future. As before, conversion could only mean one thing in Babylonia, as it had meant but one thing in Judah, the abandonment of idolatry and the return to Yahveh.

But this simple statement of the aim of all prophetic endeavour by no means implied the surrender of the cultus. On the contrary, it really involved its purification. It was true that off the sacred soil the practices of worship were necessarily suspended. It had been one of the trials which Hosea had predicted that the children of Israel must abide many days without sacrifice and rite, nay, that their very food in a foreign land would be unclean (*Hos.* iii. 4, ix. 3). The same idea lies in Ezekiel's mind when he represents the food that will be eaten in captivity as mingled with human dung and so defiled (*Ez.* iv. 13). When, therefore, some of the exiles attempted to establish the worship of Yahveh at the high places of Babylonia, the attempt ran counter to the fixed system of Israelite tradition, and could not be tolerated in the face of the Deuteronomic law. Nevertheless, there

can be no doubt that the enforced abolition of the cultus was a terrible trial to those who had regarded it as the necessary expression of their religion, and especially to those who had themselves taken part in it as priests. Even Jeremiah, with his doctrine of the new covenant, cannot look forward to the restored Jerusalem without the revival of the old order ; temple and priest and sacrifice shall all be there.

Hear Yahveh's word, O ye heathen, and declare it in distant coasts, and say, "He that scattered Israel will gather him and keep him as a shepherd his flock." For Yahveh redeemeth Jacob, and ransometh him from the hand of the stronger one, and they come and rejoice upon Zion's height, and flow to Yahveh's good things, to the corn and the sweet wine and the oil, and to the young of the flock and of the herd, so that their soul shall become as a watered garden, and they shall no more languish again. Then will the maiden rejoice in the dance, and youths and old men together, and I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow. And I will satiate the priests' desire with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my good things, saith Yahveh (*Jer.* *xxi.* 10—14 ; *cp.* *xxxiii.* 17—22, if the passage may be accepted as genuine).

The revived worship was to realise the utmost longings of the priests ; and it followed, therefore, not unnaturally, that the members of the sacred tribe of Levi, especially, should occupy themselves with the hope of its renewal. This had, indeed, engaged the thought of the first deportation even before the final fall of the city. For ten years the nobles and priests who had been carried off with Jehoiachin, held fast to the hope of the maintenance of the capital and their speedy return. They refused to listen to the melancholy burden which Ezekiel had caught up from Jeremiah ; and the little circle of priests of which he is to us the central figure concerned itself largely with the prospect of restoration. It is plain from Ezekiel's writings how prominent a place this occupied in his own hopes. Yahvism would revive with the revival of the national life. Yahvism had never existed without cultus ; no religion that antiquity had seen had attained any other form of expression. If, then, Yahvism was to be reconstituted without idolatry, the cultus must be strictly laid down ; its elements must be carefully prescribed, its principles distinctly formulated, its

very methods elaborated, so as to protect them from any perversion in the future by guilty hands. So long as the temple-priests survived in their captivity, with any likelihood of their own return, it might suffice for them to cherish the memory of their former service. But as one by one passed away, and the expected deliverance did not come, it became necessary to put on record in some more definite terms the ritual usage of the true religion. Ritual there must be: and if the Deuteronomists had not succeeded in pledging the nation to fulfil the demands of holiness, there was no other way open than that which they had trod, but it must be pursued with greater firmness into minuter detail. Hitherto Prophecy and Law had both looked to the same end, but neither had attained it. Now Yahveh had himself taken the discipline of his people into his own hands: he was purifying them by suffering, and would restore them to their own land to renew their service.

• There they must be protected against every temptation: and Ezekiel accordingly proceeded to show how this might be done. Fence round the cultus with every possible precaution; allow it only on one spot, the holy mountain; place it in the charge of a special order, the Zadokite priests of the old Jerusalem guild; withdraw the ancient rights of the laity, and entrust the guardianship of the sacred house to the Levitical body; close up the sacred precincts; determine the privileges of the lay ruler, taking care to exclude him wholly from the temple, that he may have no chance of treating it after the manner of the elder sovereigns as his private chapel, into which he may introduce what worship he pleases; draw up a calendar of the feasts, specify the necessary offerings; and then the guarantees of holiness will be more secure, and out of the renewal of the right relation between God and man the noblest fruits of life may yet be won.

This is the meaning of the remarkable sketch of the polity of the future, with which the book of Ezekiel closes (xl.—xlviii.) Its dominant purpose is to give practical effect to the idea of Israel's holiness as the peculiar people of

Yahveh, to secure the establishment of the true religion, and its preservation uncorrupt. In the high prophetic sense Jeremiah had already promised this of the dear fatherland, and of the capital hallowed by Yahveh's presence :—

Thus saith Yahveh of hosts, Israel's God, Again shall they use this speech in the land of Judah and in the cities thereof when I shall bring again their captivity, "Yahveh bless thee, thou habitation of righteousness, thou holy mountain" (*Jer. xxxi. 23*).

The hope of Jeremiah was the hope of Ezekiel too.. The dead Israel would be quickened; the defiled Israel should be cleansed; the scattered Israel should be gathered; the nation should once more be one body, with a new heart, a new spirit. This would be the divine work. What would be Israel's response? The same self-will, the same stubbornness, the same idolatry as of old? It was not without peril. Even the regeneration might fail, as Isaiah and the Deuteronomic reforms had failed, unless the worship of Yahveh alone were made absolutely sure. So Ezekiel draws the picture of the ancient land divided anew; the holy mount surrounded by the holy territory of the priests; the holy house upon the holy mount; the holy men to serve the holy house. His delineation of the future has no resemblance to the glowing visions of ideal prophecy; the national element has disappeared; we hear no more of universal sovereignty, the splendour of the throne, the prosperity of the people. It is a legislative code for the maintenance of religion. Prophecy has again found it necessary to take the form of Law.

VIII.

The legislation of Ezekiel was, of course, largely founded upon the order of the old temple, though it introduced important modifications. It was not, however, by any means complete. Hence it was open to others to follow up the way which he had begun. Similar labours would seem to have been gradually undertaken by others of the sacred caste, until a considerable mass of legislative material was accumulated, in which the cultus of antiquity was

enriched, expanded, and transformed. It was inevitable that a system thus evolved should lose that national character which breathes through the earlier codes. Its first idea was the separation of Israel from all pollution of foreign elements and heathen rites. It was intended for the nucleus of the faithful who could write themselves down of pure descent, and of unmixed blood. It did not smell of the soil. It did not breathe the air of cornfield and vineyard, giving natural expression to the cycles of the year. The householder, the village Levite, the local community with its elders—all these disappear. The new system does not seem to have its roots in Israel's history; it does not grow irregularly out of the past, it comes down straight from Heaven with a divine completeness. Each fresh detail is imposed by Yahveh's express command. That which in the old days had been the upreaching of man to God, is now presented in a different form. It is the demand of God from man: and thus accepted and fulfilled, it becomes the utterance of devoted trust, it is the symbol of Israel's lowly submission to Yahveh's will.

So, while the spirit of Prophecy, following out the thoughts of Jeremiah, attained its loftiest height in the oracles of the Babylonian Isaiahs, the successors of Ezekiel adopt the path of positive Law, realising the necessary practical consequences of their situation. Once more, with which of the two does the future lie? Read the magnificent strains in which the rebuilding of Jerusalem is celebrated (*Is. lx.*), and contrast it with the depressing incidents of the restoration. Cyrus, indeed, came, Israel was released, the new Jerusalem was founded; but it was no city whose walls were salvation, and its gates praise. That spontaneous recognition of Yahveh's might, which the return of his chosen servant was to excite among all peoples—where was it? The nations around took no notice, except to harass and worry the little band of the faithful. Enthusiasm declined, dejection crept over the energies that had been vigorous and active. The work languished through opposition without and half-heartedness within.

The Deuteronomic code had been accepted as the basis of the new order; but the stringency of adherence to the separatist principle had been relaxed; the relation of the Jews to their neighbours became complicated by mixed marriages impairing the religious purity of the community; the whole work was in danger of being undone; the entire gains of the past were imperilled; the terrible lessons of the Captivity were fading out of remembrance; the prospect that Israel would fulfil the demands of its ideal holiness seemed once more hopelessly remote.

IX.

It was at this juncture that Ezra arrived. How much communication there had been between the Jews in the mother city, and their brethren in Babylonia, we cannot conjecture; but there seems no reason to suppose that that intercourse and correspondence which took place in the days of Jeremiah, and again in those of Nehemiah, had ever been wholly suspended. We may presume, then, that the exiles beyond the Euphrates were not unacquainted with the tendencies operating in their ancestral land; and it is possible, and indeed probable, that the idea of the consolidation of the new law was worked out there, independently of existing circumstances in Judah. It was in some respects an easier task to preserve the principles of separatism inviolate in Babylonia. There the deported Jews were in the midst of people of different speech, with no common traditions, worshipping other deities, observing strange and unfamiliar rites. But in Judah, on the other hand, the restored Jews were surrounded on every side by peoples claiming kindred with them, using the same language, descendants of those who had occupied the same soil, had shared the same history, had offered their sacrifices at the same altars. They were tempted, therefore, in a thousand ways, from which their brethren in the East were exempt. Moreover, they were exposed to the lowering effects of grievous disappointment. In Babylonia it was

still possible to idealise ; it was not possible upon the spot. Amid the difficulties pressing on the new community, there could be little or no hope of the coming of that future to which they still looked forward. The advent of that time must depend on the national faithfulness, and the only mode of securing this appeared to be to pledge the unanimous activity of the entire community to the fulfilment of a sacred law, designed anew to give expression to that solemn relation of holiness in which the people stood to Yahveh. The Deuteronomic law had been insufficient, for it belonged to a state of things already long past ; it did not deal with a number of elements which had since then largely increased in importance. The law which was now to be raised into practical sovereignty, must guard Israel much more carefully from every kind of defilement and impurity. It must lift the sacred worship into a place which it had never occupied before. It must enforce the principle of separation from the worldly and the idolatrous, so that the bond between Yahveh and Israel, and the Holy Land, might never again be broken. It was the great achievement of Ezra and Nehemiah to plant the law, thus elaborated on the basis of the labours of the Babylonian schools, in the midst of the streets of Jerusalem, and to secure for it so firm a hold that it never afterwards faded from its place. This new law was the Levitical Legislation.

The fundamental principle of this, the latest of the three codes now included in our Pentateuch, ran thus, " Be ye holy, for I, Yahveh your God, am holy " (*Lev. xix. 2*). It is plain at once that the idea of Israel's holiness here expands from the older notion of Yahveh's consecrated property to acquire a profound moral significance. It is no longer a description of a relation. Formerly Israel had been holy as belonging to Yahveh. But Yahveh could not be holy as belonging to Israel : Yahveh was holy through the transcendence of his own nature above everything earthly and unclean. Yahveh's holiness, therefore, involved the totality of his attributes as deity. But when it was made the ground of comparison

between himself and man, the aim and goal of human endeavour, it evidently bore a more special sense, and is plainly limited by the authors of the Levitical code to those moral elements of the divine nature with which man has kin. The holiness required of Israel was to penetrate all life, regulating deed and word and thought. In one aspect it gives birth to an immense number of ritual ordinances, often of the most minute and tiresome character, all intended to secure the strictest purity at once of person and of conduct. In another it rose to the loftiest perception of the true basis of all social relations. The Deuteronomist had laid down the first principle of all religion in the love of God ; the Levitical Law now summed up human duty in the second and consequent principle, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This principle really embodies the whole of the older prophetic ethics ; and as Deuteronomy had carried religion into the midst of the affections, so now does the Levitical Law set morals by its side. The notions of public right and social justice have at length become individualised, and the alliance between religion and morals is complete.

It is not then surprising that in the Levitical Legislation we should meet with what seem at first sight the most glaring contradictions within the range of that single idea of holiness common alike to Prophecy and Law. On the one side is its whole scheme of holy things—vessels, furniture, vestments, sanctuary, its holy persons—the priests, its holy days of festival. Does not this materialise an elevated and spiritual conception ? On the other hand is the representation of the Holy God, and the demand that his people shall resemble him : and what has this to do with special objects, places, seasons, men ? The two views were no doubt inconsistent, but they were for a time necessary to each other. Not yet could the ritual be cast aside. The law was the vehicle through which the truths of the higher Prophetism were preserved, and made available for the national life. The framers of the code did what the Isaiahs had not been able to do ; but without the Isaiahs they could not have done it. The Levitical Legislation was the great agent by which

Yahvism was saved and consolidated and sent forth on a new career. It had been the glory of the prophets to discern a far-off goal of spiritual religion ; but they could only connect their future with their present by divine revolutions which never took place. The Law endeavoured to bring the principles of the sole deity of Yahveh, which they had steadily elaborated, into direct application to the circumstances of a community still in danger of frittering away the positive gains of prophetic thought. It thus accomplished what Prophecy had failed to find practical means to achieve. In the piety of the Psalms we see the blossom of its idea of holiness. The "Saints," so full of love and trust, waiting for Yahveh to show them the path of life, these are the holy people nurtured under the Law. And so the Law rescued Yahvism permanently from the danger of external corruption, and it formed a shell through which no outward influences could pierce and wound. The shell might be hard and rigid ; but the intrinsic spiritual power of the true religion within it lived and grew, till the fulness of time was come at last. Then the Law gave way again to Prophetism in the still nobler form of the Gospel, and its essential aim after the divine ideal—"Be ye holy, for I, Yahveh your God, am holy"—was set free for ever from local limitation, and transfigured into the supreme end of all religion—"Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

J. ESTLIN CARPENTER.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN MÜNSTER.

SOME few years before the end of the first quarter of the 16th century, the dawn of a brighter day seemed about to burst upon the dark night of the myriad toilers in Germany. A free peasantry had been forced into the most galling serfdom by a brutal and ignorant nobility, whose chivalry had degenerated to vulgar licence, and whose knightly spirit of adventure found profitable, if somewhat hazardous employment in highway robbery. The spirit of selfishness growing rampant with the decay of the old religious influences had led the German princelets to the most detestable doctrines of petty autocracy, and they welcomed with delight the Roman jurists, who found no place in their system for primitive folk customs, village jurisdiction, or the communal rights of a free peasantry. The peasant must no longer fetch his firewood from the forest, drive his cattle into the common meadow, or kill the game which destroyed his crops. His barns were burnt at night, he was carried off for a pitiable ransom even on his way to mass, and if he did not fulfil his legal or imposed obligations to the letter, he was punished in the most barbarous fashion, not infrequently culminating in death. On the other hand, the mad craving for wealth in the towns was destroying the old independence of the handicraftsman; the great extension of trade, the rise of commercial speculation and the perversion of the old guild system were making him more and more a tool in the hands of the moneyed classes. The Church, which for long had held in check with its spiritual terrors the individual struggle for power, had fallen into a state of corruption, which called down upon it the contempt of the

community. The poor and the helpless no longer found in the established religion that spiritual comfort, which might have strengthened them to endure their material misery. The great ideas of mediæval Christianity were fast losing their influence over the minds of men; the spiritual seemed dying out in the folk, which was rushing blindly along in its race for material prosperity, and with the usual result—the stronger arm, the stronger head went to the fore, but the weaker, the more ignorant were forced closer and closer to their hopeless grinding toil. The nobles hated the princelets, the towns detested both alike, while the peasantry was bitter in its denunciations of all who took refuge behind walls of stone. On all sides were signs of the decay of the social spirit, of the rise of a new materialistic selfish conception of life—irreligious in the truest sense of the word. Self-sacrifice—which can arise only from clearness of vision, or from a strong and fervid religious consciousness—was to all appearances dead. Every man was hurrying along in the race for worldly prosperity, and a Church no longer conscious of its mission, nay, which scarce blushed at its own impurity, could not cry, “Halt!—think of thy neighbour!” In vain the poorer members of the community sought around them for the cause of this misery, they sat helplessly looking into the night and waiting for a prophet! And then Luther came—Luther, the son of a peasant, boldly facing the indolent priest and the tyrannic prince—preaching a new gospel, a ‘pure evangely,’ full of comfort for men’s souls! What wonder that the dawn seemed breaking for the folk, that they fancied the national deliverer had arisen?

For a short time peasant and craftsman, the humble toilers of all sorts, looked to Luther as to a god. What could this ‘pure evangely’ mean—which proclaimed the Bible as sole authority and itself as the primitive Christian faith—if it did not herald a return to brotherly love, mutual charity and an apostolic simplicity of life? What wonder that those poor ignorant folk, when they read the fiery appeals of Luther and his fellow theologians cast abroad o’er the land, thought the battle was not for a dogma, not for the letter

but for a total change in men's habits of life. They did not want a new set of doctrines, they did not want a new pope, they wanted a richer life for the listless struggler in the city, a more joyous home for the toiler on the land. They wanted the bread of a new emotion in life, and they were given dogmatic stones.

Worn out by generations of oppression the peasants banded themselves together and took as their password the 'pure evangely'; throughout the district of the bund this, and this only should be proclaimed from the pulpit. Could the people, could the princes once hear this Divine word there would be no need of dispute, its very simplicity would bring conviction to the minds of all. Poor simple peasants, the 'pure evangely' was clear enough to you, but hardly what the rulers of men were inclined to accept! Nevertheless you drew up your twelve modest demands and based each one of them on an appeal to Scripture and a plea of brotherly love. Brotherly love indeed! Were you not rebels disobeying the higher powers—or worse, disobeying God, by whom all the powers that be are ordained? So Melancthon told you, so Luther told you. Nay, even if there were some shadow of justice in your claims, you still deserved a fearful judgment for the terrible sin of angering the powers that be! Even, if all your articles were in the 'pure evangely,' which Wittenberg was not inclined to admit, still you must wait, sit down and wait in your misery till the "pure evangely" should develop itself. That was the only consolation the new prophets had to offer you! *

It is little wonder that the peasants grew restless, that the terrible wrongs of the past would be ever reminding the present of its strength. Here and there the pent-up passion, the blind brute impulse to revenge, broke its fetters, and an awful judgment of blood fell upon the toilers' oppressors. Then Luther gave tongue to words which shocked even his own century:—"A rebel is outlawed of God and Kaiser, therefore who can and will first slaughter such

* Melancthon, *Wider die Artikel der Bauernschaft*. 1525.

a man does right well: since upon such a common rebel every man is alike judge and executioner. Therefore who can shall here openly or secretly smite, slaughter and stab, and hold that there is nothing more poisonous, more harmful, more devilish than a rebellious man." Those words were the funeral knell of the 'pure evangely' in the hearts of the simple and ignorant oppressed. The peasants were slaughtered by the thousand, massacred as they stood nigh helpless with pitchfork and hoe—racked, flayed, burnt, one or all—ay, any other refinement of agony the scared ruler of men could contrive was eagerly adopted. But note, from that day forth Luther might found churches, but they were built on the will of the princes; he might still be a prophet, but not of the masses—a prophet of the *bourgeoisie*.

The peasant rebellion was repressed and society breathed again, conscious that it had got the turbulent stream once more into its narrow bed, and, so long as it stayed there and turned society's mill-wheels at the wonted pace, quite regardless of its chafings and eddyings and foamings. Not so however the toilers, not so many another, who were weary of this round of theological disputation, this tossing about of dogmas, this religion of the letter. The longings, the almost heart-sick yearning of the weary for a new spiritual guide was not blunted utterly, not yet reduced to a dull mechanical sense of the hopelessness of life. If they had thrown off the yoke of Antichrist, rejected the Roman Sodom, could they not likewise discard the 'new pope of Wittenberg,' the priest of the letter?—If the teachers had all gone astray, could not the simple-minded build up a faith for themselves, and what better foundation than the Bible, the undoubted word of God? Here was a new world, a new light for the folk—this Bible should be their priest and their Church—its wondrous powers should illuminate the craftsman at his bench and the peasant at his plough. Here was a theology without learning, a faith without dogma. Each might draw pure religion from the one book, and none dreamt that much was unintelligible,

or might be interpreted in a thousand different fashions. The Bible spoke directly to men in the voice of God; nay, might not that voice itself speak to them as it had done to the faithful of old? So again arose the conception of a strange mystic converse with God,—the Divine spirit within comforting the miserable and oppressed. Even their very misery, the toil and burden of life might be the origin of this strange union,—the very cause which carried them heavenwards. How could such men believe in Luther's dogma of justification by faith *alone*? A life of suffering, of labour, of self-repression was the key to their most spiritual emotions. With the failure of the peasant rebellion they had given up all hopes of a social or political reconstruction; they awaited in patience all the future might bring forth; they would willingly have separated themselves from the world if the world had but left them, which it would not, in peace.

"O dear brothers and sisters, we know how false the pope is, but from those who should teach us this we hear nought but quarrelling and abuse; the whole world sees how they are divided against each other. O Almighty God, we appeal to thee!—I pray all men in God's name, who desire salvation, that they will not despise His message, since the times are very terrible! Every day we hear those, who should teach the folk, say that he whom God has ordained to sin must sin, and he whom God has ordained to salvation, must be saved. O most beloved sisters and brothers, let us fly from this error! Has not Christ said: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden'? And shall not each of us go and be saved? Our teachers have led us astray, it is time that we turn from them, and, depart from this darkness! We believe no longer in the mass, nor the pleading of saints. We believe no longer in the cloister, the priest, or aught of popedom. We know they have long led us astray. We do not think long prayers are good, as prayer has been hitherto; if one only prays 'Our Father,' and understands it, 'tis enough. We do not want pictures and images, nor should

God be worshipped in a temple built with human hands; the only temple in which He will dwell is the heart of man. O dearest sisters and brothers throughout the world, help me to pray fervently to God for safety from these errors. Oh, how long we have been living in sin! But what did the folk who, ignorant of the crucified One, had been living in sin, say to the apostle? 'O dear friend, what shall we do?' And Peter answered them: 'Repent, repent, and let each one be baptized to the forgiveness of sins in the name of Christ Jesus!' Then all men went and were gladly baptized to the number of three thousand. Shall we not do likewise? O dearest brothers and sisters, take this book with patience and in fear of God, since in my whole life I have not written a syllable against any man—I speak in the truth which is God himself."*

Such is the simple spirit of these early Anabaptists, not a touch of the bitterness or abusive language of the current theology; there is an unmistakable, almost terrible earnestness about it, which carries no ring of falsehood. For such men the Catholic Church had in earlier days found an outlet in new monastic orders; now this was impossible. Still less could the 'pope of Wittenberg' give them a place in his new evangelical Church. His justification by faith alone and his serfdom of the human will were to them unintelligible doctrines; nay, the rapid spread of this simple-minded faith threatened to destroy the 'pure evangely' altogether; the oppressed of all parties turned to this new brotherhood. The enthusiasm which Luther had once evoked flowed into this new channel; here was a simple-minded piety, a brotherly love, an apostolic Christianity, which the masses had sought in vain in the 'pure evangely'! With Bible as guide, the members of this new community separate themselves from the rest of the world; rebaptism shall be the passage from the old world of sin to the new world of love. Simple in the extreme are their tenets—community

* *Ein Göttlich vund gründtlich offenbarung; von den warhaftigen wider-teuffern: mit göttlicher warhait angezeigt. MDXXVII.*

of earthly goods and a future where there shall be no usury or tax. The brethren accept no office, and carry no sword; patience is to be their sole weapon, and brotherly correction, followed, if necessary, by expulsion from the community, the only punishment. After baptism, their one ceremony is that of bread-breaking, a communion of love and a reminder that all are brothers and sisters in the Lord Christ. Simple, and yet almost grand, in its simplicity is this re-establishment of primitive Christianity among the first Anabaptists.

The evangelical leaders, however, grow alarmed for the safety of their own Churches:—Luther sees in it all the direct agency of hell; he has no sooner stopped one mouth than the Devil opens ten others. The Anabaptists are prophets of the Devil, and as heretics to the 'pure evangely' are rebels to be punished by the authorities. He has done his duty in refuting them, and the blood of all who will not listen to his advice must be upon their own heads.* It is painful nowadays to note how Luther utterly failed to grasp the religious essence of this primitive faith. He saw neither the want which called it forth, nor the earnest truth of its followers. Had he been of a more tolerant, more broadly sympathetic mind, the history of German Protestantism might have had brighter chapters to record amidst its weary waste of theological wrangling. Zwingli, too, began to fear for the safety of the Swiss church. His toleration had drawn many of the religious radicals to Zürich, and at first he had condescended to dispute with them, leaving, as usual, the decision to the Town Council. Town Council, indeed! What had these enthusiasts to do with such a body? "God has long ago given judgment," they cried, "it is not in the power of men to judge." Then Zwingli began to talk about heresy, and the need of extermination. "No one had a right," he said, "to leave the church or follow any other opinion than that of the majority—than that appointed by the legal repre-

* *Von den Wiedertaufe, an zwei Pfarherrn 1528. Von den Schleichern und Winkelpredigern, 1532.*

sentatives of the community." Whereupon the Anabaptists girded themselves about with rope, and as if prepared for a journey, wandered through the streets of Zürich. Upon the market-place and in the open squares they halted to preach, talked of the need of a better life, of justice and brotherly love. "Woe, woe upon Zürich!" they cried, half threatening, half warning. What was to be done with these fiery enthusiasts—they were not criminals, they were not rebels? Banishment, suggested Zwingli, and repression and banishment followed throughout Switzerland.

Banishment scattered the sparks all over southern Germany, from Strassburg to the Tyrol. The apostles of this simple faith came like the early Christian teachers into the homes of the poor. They entered with the greeting of peace, and taught in plain, homely words, bringing new light, untold comfort into many a weary heart. The preacher arrived, taught, aroused the listless spirit, baptized, took up his staff and passed on. So in a few hours he might plant a little community of the new faith on a spot where he had never been seen before, and never might come again. The little community chose its own head, who had the simple duties of Bible-teaching, reproving, baptizing, and bread-breaking. The brethren and sisters would meet on Sundays for Bible-reading, for mutual exhortation, and to celebrate their primitive form of the Communion. Their clothing was simple and without ornament, they saluted one another with a kiss and "Peace be with you," while each termed the other brother or sister. Their property was at the service of all members who might need it, they prohibited the oath and the sword. None of them might engage in a law-suit or take a place of authority, for all government to them was the rod of God sent to chastise his folk; the brethren should obey it, paying rather too much than too little, patiently enduring suffering and persecution, awaiting the coming of the Lord.* These primitive Christians endeavoured to live apart from the world, avoided

* Cf Carl Alfred Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufbruchs*, a most excellent book which unfortunately remains incomplete.

the churches, the taverns, the social gatherings of citizens and guilds, nay, even the greeting of unbelievers, for were they not God's own folk, men who had taken up Christ's cross and were determined to follow him? Justification by faith *alone*, indeed! Was not their life of suffering their justification? Persecuted, deprived of all means of subsistence, or hunted down like wild beasts, they laid down a witness in their life which passed all the power of words. There was something far beyond Luther here! There was a depth of earnest conviction about these Anabaptists which completely puzzled the Lutherans, even the very courage with which they met a martyr's death was the work of the Devil, or was an obstinacy born of passionate hatred to their persecutors! Even Capito saw the truth more clearly than Luther; "I testify before God," he writes, "that I cannot say their contempt of death arises from infatuation, much rather from a divine impulse. There is no passion, no excitement to be marked; no, with deliberation and wondrous endurance they meet death as confessors of Christ's name!"

Such was the material upon which persecution was to react, and it is one of the most instructive, although most terrible lessons of history to mark what persecution made out of this material. First and foremost let us obtain some conception of what that persecution meant; only then shall we be able to judge truly of the catastrophe which followed. Men are so apt to be shocked by the brutal outrages of a great folk-upheaval that they cannot grasp to the full the long years of oppression, the grinding torture, the bitter injustice, which at last causes the repressed passions to break forth in a torrent of molten lava-torrent sweeping before it all the bonds of customary morality, every restraint which knits society together. Persecution first reached a head in the Catholic districts, where Anabaptism was held a capital offence. In the Tyrol we find in 1531 upwards of a thousand executed. At Linz alone, in six weeks, seventy-three! Duke William of Bavaria gave orders that those who recanted should be beheaded, those who would not were to be burnt!

The Swabian Bund organised bands of soldiers to hunt down Anabaptists, and to kill the captives on the spot without trial! As soon as the Evangelicals felt strong enough, they, too, joined in the wild chase. The Anabaptists had introduced a partial community of goods among themselves; it was declared from the pulpit that they aimed at the confiscation of all property; their prophecies as to the end of the world were declared open rebellion; the darkest, most vile political and social motives were attributed to them. Preachers poured out the foulest abuse upon them, and encouraged the growth of a religious hatred which sprang up with its wonted rapidity and its characteristic bitterness. Anabaptists were now declared political offenders. They were beheaded in Saxony and drowned in Zürich. The blood of leaders and disciples flowed in streams upon the land: Mantz was executed at Zürich; Michael Sattler, at Rotenburg, was torn in pieces by red-hot pincers and then burnt; Hubmaier, comforted by his faithful wife, was burnt at Vienna; Blaurock was burnt in the Tyrol, Rinck was imprisoned for life in Hesse, Hätzer beheaded at Constanz. In Salzburg, however, the tide of brutality seems to have reached its flood. Here a brotherhood had been founded which met on waste spots, worshipped in a primitive fashion, and shared their goods together. The sign of membership was rebaptism. Thirty of its members being captured, their preacher and two others were burnt alive in the Fronhof, because they could by no means be brought to confess their errors. A woman and a bright maiden of sixteen years refused to recant, although told their lives would be spared; the executioner dragged them to the horse-pond, held them under the water till they were drowned, and then burnt their bodies. Two others, one even of noble birth, the other a wallet-maker, were, on confessing their error, beheaded and burnt! A button-maker and a belt-maker who remained obstinate were burnt on the market place; we are told "they lived long and cried with all their hearts to God; it was pitiable to hear them!" Ten women and several men who confessed were banished. "Upon the following

Wednesday, a town-notary, a priest and three others, among them a young and handsome belt-maker, were led out of the town to a house, where they had held their services, and as they would not recant, but boldly defended their opinions and had no fear of martyrdom, they were placed inside the house and it was set on fire; they lived for a long while, and cried piteously to one another. God help them and us according to His pleasure." Not content with destroying the persons of these poor folk, the very houses in the town, we are told, where they had met, were burnt down for a memorial. "Forty-one persons still lie in gaol, no one knows what will be done with them. God settle it for the best."*

Needless perhaps to heap up further witness of this terrible baptism of blood! Men, women, and even children went boldly singing psalms to the stake; the very bonds which bound the community together seemed to grow stronger and stronger as the list of martyrs increased. Heart-rending are the songs which the poor suffering peasants and handicraftsmen sent up to God from their prison houses! Some breathe a quiet spirit of resignation: "O God, to thee I must appeal against the violence which in these evil days has befallen me. For Thy word's sake I suffer greatly, lying in prison I am threatened with death. They led me bound before their rulers, but with Thy grace I was ready to confess Thy Name. They asked me of our faith, and I told them it was the word of Christ. They asked me, who was our leader, and I told them Christ and His teaching. He, our true Saviour, has promised us peace. To that I hold fast, that I will seal with my blood." He, who first sung this song was named Johann Schütz, and to strengthen his comrades he has sent it from the prison cell: "let man trust in God, however great his need let him put faith in no other. He can give life for death." Or again: "The world rages and palms off its falsehoods upon us; it terrifies us with its burning and slaughter. We are scattered as the sheep, who have lost their shepherd; we wandered through the forests; like the

* *Neue Zeyttung von den widderteuffern und yhrer Sect newlich erwachsen yhm stift zu Salzburg vnd an andern enden. MDXXVIII.*

ravens we seek refuge in cave and cleft. We are pursued like the birds of the air, we are hunted down with dogs, and led like dumb lambs captive and in bonds. Through the agony and sorrow of death the bride of the Lord hastens to the marriage feast." Other songs again show a spirit which, like the worm, must turn at last. "O Lord, how long wilt Thou be silent? Judge their pride, let the blood of Thy saints ascend before Thy throne." Painfully intense hymns, evidently written for congregational singing, call upon God for aid and, at last, for vengeance.* Ballads of their martyrs, as that of the Two Maidens of Beckum, burnt by the tyrants of Burgundy, strengthened the faith in the hearts of the persecuted, and fanned their conviction almost to the fanaticism of despair.

In vain we seek a justification for this reign of terror, its only cause lay in the ignorant, nay, completely brute self-assertion of the powerful of earth. They never troubled themselves to examine the real convictions of these simple-minded folk; they accepted all the denunciations of their own narrow-minded theologians as based on fact; they saw rapidly spreading what they were taught to believe was a vast political conspiracy, and they stopped at no brutality which they fancied might check its growth, no bloodshed which could assist the work of extermination. Persecution brought, as it always does, a terrible retribution upon blind humanity. The Anabaptists driven wild with cruelty began to take a harsher view of their persecutors. Such horrors could only precede the day of judgment. They were surely among the terrors of the last days announced in the Book of the Revelation. God would surely come to avenge the blood of His saints:—"Await your Shepherd, since He is near who shall come at the end of the world." "Rejoice with all your heart and all your soul, thank God and praise

* *Münsterische Geschichten, Sagen und Legenden*, 1825. *Inter alia*, the song beginning—

"In diesen letzten Zeiten,
 "Wo wir auf beiden Seiten
 "Mit falschen Schlangen streiten."
 (i.e. Luther and the Pope!)

Him, since the Lord has revealed to us brothers the time wherein He will punish those who have persecuted and scattered you. Those who have slain with the sword, shall be themselves slain with the sword; those who have hung the faithful, shall themselves be hung; those who have condemned the pious, shall meet with a like judgment. So also shall they without mercy be condemned according to the terrible anger of the Lord." Let the brethren be prepared to cross the Red Sea, ready to leave the land of Pharaoh. God is building a new Sion—a place of comfort for His people. The day of redemption is at hand.*

It is strange what an enormous influence the Book of Revelation has had in shaping many of the greatest movements of the world. The notion of a coming destruction, a terrible retribution upon the oppressors of men, the founding of a new and purer era—a kingdom of the good alone, the millennium of joy and the coming of Christ have a wondrous attraction for the injured and the miserable; it is the channel into which the thought and the hope of Franciscan dreamers, of Lollards and of Anabaptists, alike drift. The allegory of the Evangelist becomes an immediate future to all those who feel strongly the need of a great reformation, a judgment on centuries of abuse and intolerance; they require a voice for their passionate protest, and they find it in the Apocalypse. In its wild demoniacal destruction of the past and its errors, in its prophecy of a brighter future, they find expressed through the weird language of inspiration the pent-up emotion of their own dumb souls. Such were the first thoughts to which persecution drove the Anabaptists:—the Divine Avenger would come and found a new Sion for His saints. But as the months rolled by, and the bloody baptism of fire continued, a new idea began to spread among the community:—the Avenger surely meant to use the righteous themselves as the sword of Gideon; the saints should themselves arise and exterminate the worshippers of idols, then might they found the kingdom

* *Zwen wunderseltzamen Sendbrieff zweyer Widertauffer an ire Rotten ge Augsburg gesandt. Verantwortung: durch Urbanum Rhegium. 1528.*

of righteousness and of love. The worm was beginning to turn at last! Let him who will cast the first stone. He who shuts his eyes to the misery of one half the human race, or thinks their wretchedness is an eternal necessity of all forms of human society, may smile cynically when he marks the simple faith of these toilers rapidly developing into a self-destructive fanaticism. Ignorant, misguided people, why did ye not keep the hand to the plough, the foot to the treadle, and the body to its bench? Why must ye strive in your darkness to build up a faith for yourselves, to take that unfathomable Book for a beacon? That was work better left to the priest, to the noisy theologian, to the professional twister of words! Get ye back to your toil, that the wheels of the social machine may run smoothly along! Your brotherly love and justice are absurd impossibilities. Cannot you see that the Book and actual life are quite different matters, and society—at least, our civilised half of it—is by no means inclined for your fancies? As the ass must be beaten, or it will not move, so must the ruler drive, beat, hang, and burn the populace, *Sir Omnes*, or it will get the bridle between its teeth; the rough, ignorant *Sir Omnes* must be driven as one drives swine.* Crudely put, but that was still the view taken then, as it is now, by many a most worthy citizen of the "inevitable" darkness of the toiling myriads. Why should *he* be responsible for the outrages, grotesque and terrible, which spring from the ignorance and folly of these "dregs of the folk †"?

But the "dregs" do not always take the same view of matters, and in the last years of the third decade the blood of our Anabaptists began to approach boiling pitch. Their leaders were all slaughtered; their organisations destroyed; they could not meet together for imparting mutual advice and mutual comfort. Each little community went on its own way, and often that way was a curious one. Nay, beyond the simple bread-breaking and adult baptism there was little in common among the various groups, persecution

* Luther.

† So Zwingli termed them.

drove each to fanaticism in its own peculiar fashion. The ties of every-day morality were in some cases cast to the winds. If Luther could find nothing forbidding polygamy in the Bible, why should not Hätzer and a few followers declare polygamy instituted by God?*. In other cases madness broke out in the most extravagant form. Some grovelled upon the earth to free themselves from sin; some acted as little children, for the Gospel declared that to be a stage to salvation; Thomas Scheyger, at the command of the Heavenly Father, beheaded his brother, with, indeed, the brother's consent; Magdalen Müllerin and her fellows went about as Christ and the apostles; some, believing themselves divinely freed from all the curses of flesh, made their liberty an excuse for every license; prophets arose interpreting wondrous dreams and proclaiming the coming of the Lord. Isolated as such outbreaks of fanaticism were, and steadily as the majority preserved their primitive tenets of a simple and moral piety, it was evident any strong new impulse, any enthusiastic prophet, might set the excited Anabaptists into an unbridled furor either of religious fanaticism or of social license.

Nor had either to wait long for an efficient motor. Religious fanaticism found its prophet in Melchior Hoffmann—social license in his pupils the prophets of Leyden. These men were the outward instruments, as persecution was the inward cause, which changed the Anabaptists from passive martyrs to ungovernable fanatics. While the process of extermination had driven the Anabaptists out of upper Germany, some had found refuge in Moravia; others, with whom we are alone concerned, had fled to Strassburg, where for a time toleration ruled. Here they and other religious radicals had gathered in such numbers that the Lutherans found comfort in the thought, that providence, in order to save the rest of the world, had allowed the dregs of heresy

* *Luther's Werke. Erlangen. Bd. 33, p. 322.* It is needless, perhaps, to note that the views of Hätzer were not generally accepted by the Anabaptists. Even in their songs polygamy was repudiated as against the direct teaching of Christ; nor is it part even of the *Münsterische Apologie*.

to flow together in Strassburg! Here, soon after 1530, Melchior Hoffmann appeared on the scene.

This man was a native of Halle in Suabia, and a skinner by trade. At first an eager disciple of Luther's, his Biblical studies and his keen sympathy with the sufferings of his fellow-toilers soon lead him beyond the 'pure evangely.' For seven years he passes a strange, adventurous life, preaching in almost all the countries of northern Europe, ever earning his bread by the work of his hand. Driven from country to country and town to town, persecuted by both Lutheran and Zwinglian, he wanders with wife and child from trouble to trouble, ever persisting in his self-appointed task. Arriving at last in Strassburg we find him busy with the Apocalypse, and denouncing all evangelical doctrines as mere faith of the letter; true Christianity is a religion of the meek, the humble, and the suffering. What wonder that the Anabaptists welcome him as their own! From Strassburg he passes as the prophet of Anabaptism into the Netherlands; but the faith he teaches is not the old brotherly love and primitive Christianity; its leading doctrine is the immediate coming of Christ. He appeals to an excited imagination, to a fancy overwrought by persecution around and by suffering at home. Surrounded by minor prophets, his life is half mysticism, half madness. Strassburg is to be the New Sion, the chosen city of the Lord, from which the 144,000 saints shall march out to preach the Word of God. He himself will then appear as Elias! Holland and Westphalia soon become covered with a network of Anabaptist communities. The poor, the handicraftsman, or the peasant, are carried away by Melchior's enthusiasm. Louder and louder, more and more earnest grow his prophecies as the year 1533 approaches, which is to end the rule of unrighteousness and witness the coming of God. Returning to Strassburg he stirs up the folk almost to outbreak. He is imprisoned, but preaches to the people in the town ditch through a window in his tower. He is shut up in a cage, but he manages to communicate with his disciples:—"The end of the world is at

hand, all the apocalyptic plagues are fulfilled except the vengeance of the seventh angel. Babylon is tottering to its fall, and Joseph and Solomon come to establish the kingdom of God." * Wondrous are the reports of his doings which reach Holland, where the excitement is intense. A second prophet and witness, he who is to reveal himself as Enoch, arises,—Jan Mathys, baker of Haarlem, fanatic of a deeper dye even than Hoffmann, who will lead the persecuted to break through all restraints. Mathys's creed is of a far more hostile character than Hoffmann's. He teaches that the saints must themselves prepare the way of the Lord. He curses all brothers who will not hear his voice, and his fanaticism overpowers the scruples of the more fearful. He points out the lesson of those nine heads wagging on their poles over the harbour of Amsterdam. He sends out apostles to baptize, and proclaims that the blood of the innocent shall be no longer shed, that the tyrants and the godless will shortly be exterminated. Everywhere is endless commotion, unlimited fermentation, among the Anabaptists. In Münster Mathys's disciple, the youthful Jan Bockelson, has won a strong foothold for the Anabaptist doctrines. The worm is beginning to turn in real earnest, it is grasping to the full the notion that God's people must separate themselves, that there may be a destruction of the godless. And then follows persecution renewed and bitter throughout Holland—the Anabaptists fly before it with one accord to Münster. Jan Mathys is with the fugitives, and he announces that God has chosen Münster for the New Sion, owing to the faithlessness of Strassburg! There towards the beginning of the year 1534 are gathered men, women, and children, from all quarters and of many classes, peasant, noble, trader, handicraftsman, monk and nun. The majority, it is true, are poor, miserable, and persecuted—the few, religious or political idealists; all are bent on establishing the rule of righteousness and love—the Kingdom of God in Münster.

* The best and fullest account in *Cornelius's Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufbruchs*.

Before entering into an account of this weird Kingdom of God—this grotesque and yet terrible drama—it will simplify matters to relate briefly the events which prepared the way for it in Münster. From the very first the Reformation took in that town a strongly political character. On the one side we find a prince-bishop, Graf Franz von Waldeck, personally utterly indifferent as to both the old faith and the new ‘*evangely*,’ and ready to adopt either, as it may serve his purpose, the maintenance of his autocratic authority; on the other side we have a populace who fancy that the ‘*pure evangely*’ means the abolition of the bishop and the triumph of self-government. The bishop, licentious, drunken, grasping after power in order to support his concubines and enjoy his feasting to the full—the populace eager for freedom, ignorant and full of contempt for the bishop and his underlings; between bishop and populace, the Town Council, composed for the most part of the patrician burghers and by no means anxious for either bishop or democracy. The bishop supported by a corrupt chapter and an indolent, if not immoral clergy—the democratic element introducing the preachers of the ‘*pure evangely*,’ and the Council desirous of organising them into a church which while opposing the bishop shall yet remain under its own thumb. Foremost among the evangelical preachers who found their way to Münster was Bernard Rottmann, by no means a leader of men, incapable of really guiding or restraining the populace. His broad sympathy with the oppressed classes, unchecked by a clear and dispassionate reason, caused him to follow folk-opinion rather than direct it; while at the same time his power of language marked him as a chief advocate of the popular cause. Carried along on the top of the stream he is the central object of attention till he dashes with it over the precipice. At first we find him preaching outside the gates of the city, as some say with the connivance of the bishop. He adopts the Lutheran doctrine that faith alone can save mankind, all the rest—form and ceremony—is the devil’s own handiwork. Notwithstanding this, he has a large following in

Münster, and the handicraftsmen and their wives flock out to hear him. His teaching is not without effect, and on Good Friday of the year 1531, during the night, the mob storm the church of St. Maurice, outside the gates, and destroy the altars, pictures, and carving. Rottmann seems to have thought it better after this event to retire, not however without the suggestion of a bribe from the Catholic clergy.* In the following year notwithstanding, he returns once more to Münster, and although he is forbidden to preach, the folk erect a wooden pulpit for him in the churchyard of St. Lambert inside the city, and at last, to prevent a riot, the church itself is given up to him. The 'pure evangely' having thus obtained a sure footing, Rottmann writes to Marburg for assistance, and we soon find six evangelical preachers in Münster battling to destroy the old Church. The Town Council and the Syndic Van der Wieck favour the preachers, because with their assistance they hope to free themselves from the obnoxious chapter. The six preachers prepare thirty articles and, with the connivance of the Council, force the Catholic clergy to a disputation. The Evangelicals are declared to have God and reason on their side, and the six parish churches are surrendered to their preachers. Meanwhile, the dean and chapter have left the town and appealed to the prince-bishop. The bishop at first attempts to play one party off against the other, and even temporises with democracy. Finally, however, he holds a council at the little town of Telgte on the Ems, and determines to starve his sheep out of their 'pure evangely.' Democracy laughs him to scorn, marches out guild-fashion to Telgte by night, and surprises the bishop's court, the council and the dean and chapter—only unfortunately not his grace, who happens to have left a few days before. The captives are brought into Münster, and handed over to the Town Council. "Here we bring you the oxen; hark how they bellow!" The bishop deprived of his 'oxen' comes to terms; the preachers shall be

* Dorpius, *Warhaftige historie wie das Evangelium zu Münster angefangen, &c.*

recognised in Münster, the cathedral alone reserved for the Catholics. So the 'pure evangely' seems to be triumphantly established.

But democracy having tasted 'evangelical freedom' is by no means disposed to stop here, and where it drifts Rottmann will follow. As the Lutherans said: "The devil finding it impossible to crush the 'pure evangely' by means of the priests, hunted up the Anabaptist prophets." Already Rottmann, the idol of the populace, has begun to be in bad odour at Wittenberg. Luther writes to the Town Council: "God has given you, as I hear, fine preachers, especial Master Bernhardt. Yet it is fitting that all preachers be truly admonished and checked. Since the devil is a knave, and can well seduce fine, pious, and learned preachers even!" Master Bernhardt, it is true, had been instituting somewhat curious ceremonies. The Holy Supper, he argued, was but a feast of brotherly love, and accordingly he broke bannocks in a pan, poured wine over them, and invited all who would to partake. He preached from the pulpit against the "bread and wine God" of the Catholics and Evangelicals alike. He found that democracy was in perfect accord with Gospel teaching, and the poor—the toilers—not only of Münster, but from far and wide gathered round him. "His doctrine is wonderful," wrote the Syndic Van der Wieck, "a miserable, depraved mob gathers round him, none of whom, so far as I know, could scrape together two hundred gulden to pay their debts!" Still the Syndic and Council grow anxious, the scum—the toiling oppressed—the persecuted and now fanatical Anabaptists are gathering round "Bannock-Bernt" in Münster. Forced on by his more radical following, he begins to express doubts as to infant baptism. Hermann Strapraede of Mörse declares from the pulpit that it is an "abomination before God." The Council appeals to Luther and Melancthon, but these names have long lost all authority among the masses. The Council orders that the Anabaptist teachers shall be driven out of the gate of the city, but the 'Spirit of the Lord' (or the Devil, as the

Evangelicals said?) moves them to march round the walls and re-enter at the opposite gate. The Council doubting its own strength, appeals to reason in the shape of a disputation, and imports Hermann von dem Busche to combat Bannock-Bernt. But Bannock-Bernt has by far and away the glibbest tongue, and after he has spoken for several hours, the Council breaks up the disputation in despair. After a little further bickering, in which the power of the radical preachers becomes more and more evident, the Council shuts up all the churches. The preachers are even more effective outside their pulpits than in them, while Rottmann, with the working classes and an ever-increasing mob of Anabaptists at his back, scoffs at the Council. He will fulfil the duty laid upon him by God, however stiff-necked be the authorities! Then the Council try a new expedient; they introduce the Catholic orator, Dr. Mumpert. Mumpert preaches against Bannock-Bernt in the cathedral, Bannock-Bernt against Mumpert in the Church of St. Servatius; which only leads to rioting and the banishment of Mumpert! In desperation the Council strives to establish an 'evangelical church order,' and imports Lutheran preachers from Hesse. Rottmann and his colleagues shall be banished. Crowds of women threaten the burgomeisters, and demand the restoration of their beloved preacher and the ejection of the Hessians. Again the mob triumphs; the Evangelicals are driven from the churches, even torn from the pulpit. Heinrich Rollius,* formerly a Lutheran, now a prophet, rushes through the town crying: "Repent! repent! and be baptized!" Many are baptized, some for fear of God, others for fear of their property. Suddenly the Anabaptists pour out of their holes and corners and seize the market-place, the Rathhaus and the town-cannon Catholics and and Evangelicals entrench themselves by the Church of 'Our Lady across the water.' Yet the 'party of order' is still the stronger; they march across the cathedral close and plant cannon facing the approaches of the market-place. But

* Shortly after Rollius was burnt as an Anabaptist at Maastricht.

then fear seizes them that the bishop will take the opportunity of falling upon the town. The Anabaptists find that they are still too few in numbers, a truce is made; all men shall hold what faith they please. "The day of the Lord has not yet come!" Peace!

Peace in a seething mass of fanaticism like this? Nay! Münster is to be the 'fortress of righteousness'; wait but a while, till more of the saints have arrived. From that day onward the saints continue to pour into Münster, and the 'party of order' dwindles away, flying with all its portable property out of the city. Bannock-Bernt declares he will preach only to the elect. Haggard-looking faces and people in strange garbs appear on the streets; families are broken up; wives speak of their husbands as the 'godless,' and even children leave their parents to become 'saints.' At midnight the gun booms over Münster, calling the Anabaptists to prayer; prophets rush with the mien of madmen, shrieking through the streets; the power of the Council vanishes in the whirlpool of fanaticism which, dark and terrible, is involving all things. On the 31st of February, 1534, the election of burgomeisters falls entirely into the hands of the Anabaptists, and they appoint their own leaders, Knipperdollinch and Kippenbroick. From that date the Kingdom of God commences in Münster!

Of the four principal actors in this terrible judgment of history, we have marked the leading characteristics of Jan Mathys and Rottmann; it is necessary to say a few words of the other two, Knipperdollinch and Jan Bockelson of Leyden. Bernt Knipperdollinch was a draper of Münster, a favourite with the folk, probably on account of his burly figure and boisterous nature. Long before the outbreak he seems to have got into difficulties with the bishop; he had sung satirical songs against him on the streets, and won folk applause by his somewhat ribald satires on the dean and chapter. At one time the bishop had put him in gaol, and the burly draper by no means forgave the insult; he determined "to burn the bishop's house about his head." Not in the least an enthusiast, he yet pinned his faith to

democracy; desirous himself of power, he was yet not strong enough to be anything but the tool of others. His fanaticism when once aroused tended rather to sensual than spiritual manifestations. He represents the brute, almost devilish, element in this mad dance. He seems at times to have been conscious of the grim humour of this mock Kingdom of God; and it is difficult to grasp whether his fanaticism was a jest or his jests the outcome of his fanaticism. Yet when captured and examined under torture he could only say that he had done all from a feeling of right, all from a consciousness of God's will! * Of a far different nature was Jan of Leyden. As the illegitimate son of a tailor in that town—his mother the maid of his father's wife—Jan's early life was probably a harsh and bitter one. Very young he wandered from home, impressed with the miseries of his class and a general feeling of the injustice in the world. Four years he spent in England seeing the poor eaten off the land by the sheep; then we find him in Flanders, married, but still in vague search of the Eldorado; again roaming, he visits Lisbon and Lübeck as a sailor, ever seeking and inquiring. Suddenly a new light breaks upon him in the teaching of Melchior Hoffmann; he fills himself with dreams of a glorious kingdom on earth, the rule of justice and of love. Still a little while and the prophet Mathys crosses his path, and tells him of the new Sion and the extermination of the godless. Full of hope for the future, Jan sets out for Münster to join the saints. Still young, handsome, imbued with a fiery enthusiasm, actor by nature and even by choice, he has no small influence on the spread of Anabaptism in that city. The youth of twenty-three expounds to the followers of Rottmann the beauties of his ideal kingdom of the good and the true. With his whole soul he preaches to them the redemption of the oppressed, the destruction of tyranny, the community of goods, and the rule of justice and brotherly love. Women and maidens slip away to the secret gatherings of the youthful enthusiast;

* Cf. *Die Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Münster*, where the confession is given in full.

the glowing young prophet of Leyden becomes the centre of interest in Münster. Dangerous, very dangerous ground, when the pure of heart are not around him; when the spirit "chosen by God" is to proclaim itself free of the flesh. The world has judged Jan harshly, condemned him to endless execration. It were better to have cursed the generations of oppression, the flood of persecution, which forced the toiler to revolt, the Anabaptists to madness. Under other circumstances the noble enthusiasm, with other surroundings, the intense will of Jan of Leyden might have left a different mark on the page of history. Dragged down in this whirlpool of fanaticism, sensuality and despair, we can but look upon him as a factor of the historic judgment, a necessary, but mournful actor in the tragedy of Münster—one of the most terrible chapters of the Greater Bible.

All is enthusiasm, ready self-sacrifice and prophetic joy in the New Sion during the first few days of its establishment. At every turn 'God be with you!' is heard upon the streets, and the cheery reply 'Amen, dear brother!' On Saturday the new burgomeisters had been elected; on the following Monday they at once proceeded to take steps for the defence of the town. With 1,500 saints they march out from the St. Maurice Gate and destroy the cloister of the same name. The buildings and all their art treasures ascend in flame to heaven, that they may not form a shelter for the godless; meanwhile bands of women carry into the town all the provisions, that can be found in the neighbourhood. Then precautions are taken for the safety of the walls and protection against surprise. No sooner is the new kingdom safe from the godless without, than it befits the saints to destroy the godless within. What are these pictures, these carvings, these coloured windows to the chosen of God? Symbols, which have long lost their meaning, badges of a slavery which is past, signs of a faith in the letter which are but cursed idols in the light of the new freedom. Let the stone prophets and apostles come crashing from their niches; carry out

these painted semblances of God and his saints and burn these abominations on the market place ! Have we not prophets and apostles of real flesh and blood, are not the saints of New Sion better than these tawdry fictions, for God is enshrined in their hearts ? Away with this outward form, these altar trappings, these gorgeous missals, these sacramental cups ! The Spirit of God works within us, why mask it in idle display ? Show your contempt for such devilish delusions in the coarsest and most forcible fashion. These archives and documents, again, what need can there be for such legal distinctions in Sion ? Naught of the past remains holy—what are these bones to us—bishops and saints, relics of men who lived in the age of sin ? On to the dunghill with them, for they cannot help us to the light of day ! So thought the Anabaptists, and stormed the churches, cleared out the relics, the art treasures, and the labour of many a generation ; what for years men in faith had been creating, the folk of New Sion in faith promptly destroyed. Barbarous, fanatic, the world has called it ! Yet, while the Anabaptists cast down stone images and burnt forms of canvas and paint, your prince-bishop also played the iconoclast,—only his images were of flesh and of blood. He drowned five Anabaptist women at Wolbeck, he burnt five at Bevergem ; ten helpless ignorant souls, yet panting as all souls for life ! What wonder the saints in Münster grew mad in their fancies, and madder in deed ! But not only was the decoration in the churches grievous to the saints, but even the churches themselves. God will not be worshipped in a temple made by human hands. Let then these masses of stone be turned to fitting purpose ; the cathedral and its close becomes Mount Sion, the gathering-place for God's elect. The Church of St. Lambert becomes St. Lambert's stone quarry, whence all may fetch stone for building their houses or repairing the city walls. A like fate meets the other sacred buildings, and over their portals are inscribed new names :—' Our Lady's Quarry,' and so forth. Woe to the brother whose unlucky tongue lets slip the old name ! As

penance he shall be forced to drink "einen pot watter"!*

The destruction, however, did not stop here; the innumerable spires and towers of the city were not only dangerous as marks for the enemy's cannon, but often reminiscences of an idolatry which had obscured the knowledge of God; so our children of the New Sion were "mighty to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God." The convents, too, can be turned to useful purposes, when once the idols have been destroyed and the idolaters ejected; for in them a home can be found for the crowd of Anabaptist strangers. Not that ejection was always necessary, since the nuns of St. Aegidius flocked to be baptized, and their sisters of Overrat followed. The true spirit of asceticism was long since dead, and in the New Sion the nuns hoped to unite holiness and the pleasures of sense. Nor were some of the monks behindhand, for we hear at least of one old convent guardian who remaining took unto himself in the latter days of Sion four wives! 'Tis a poor race of folk this, with none of the noble aims of early Christian asceticism, a very dangerous earthy element in the new kingdom of the spirit. Nay, a stupid little abbess who even does fly with her nuns can tell us but little of the doings of the saints. She has no conception of the meaning of this great religious fermentation. It is all very wicked, all very terrible, all comes of a runaway Wittenberg monk saying mass in German and administering the communion in two forms. She had fled with her nuns to Hiltorpe, and there on the first night they found nothing to eat and drink, and some of the sisters had been so thirsty that they had been compelled to drink—water!† Both the saints and godless seem to have had a horror of water! Still one more test follows of the faith of the saints. On the night of Thursday, the 26th, the prophet Mathys preaches against the letter, and calls upon the folk to destroy all the books in Israel, all except the Bible. Books,

* *Heinrich Gresbecks Bericht in the Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Münster Bd. 2.*

† *Chronik des Schwesterhauses Nieninck in the Geschichtsquellen.*

it is, that have led men astray, twisting with words and quibbling o'er phrases. The truth has been strangled in a network of written lies, and God could not reach the heart of man. Pile up the books on the market place, the kingdom of Sion is based on the spirit, not the letter, and the wisdom of the past is idle delusion in the light of this new day. Ascend in flame, ye vain strivings of the human brain, Sion starts unhampered by your dark questionings; her knowledge is granted directly from God; her wisdom is the outcome of inspiration; she has naught to do with the toiling, erring reason of the past!

But not even yet is Sion purified, not even yet are the godless separated from the saints! On Friday, the last day of the first week of the establishment of God's kingdom in Münster, the prophets rush inspired through the streets with cries of, 'Repent, repent, ye godless! Out of the city of the blessed, ye idolaters! God is aroused to punish you!' On the same day the saints hunt the godless out of the town, all who will not be baptized. The poor unfortunate Evangelicals escape from the fury of the Anabaptists only to fall into the hands of the bishop—the Syndic Van der Wieck and two Lutheran preachers are promptly beheaded without trial! What wonder that many remain and are baptized? For three days the cry of 'Out with the godless!' resounds through the streets, for three days the prophets stand baptizing on the market place. Before each prophet is placed a pitcher of water, and as the folk come up one by one and kneel before them, they exhort the converts to brotherly love, to leave the evil and follow the good; then they baptize them with three handfuls of water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Each new brother or sister is given a metal token with the letters D. W. W. F. inscribed upon it: "Das Wort ward Fleisch,"—the word became flesh. Even when the baptizing on the market place is over, the prophets go round the town, baptizing the old and feeble. Every house is inspected, and if any godless are found, their property is seized for the benefit of the community while the owners are driven from

their homes. So at last the New Sion is purified! What is the value of such a purification? It might purge the 'Kingdom of God' of human foes; could it reach the germs of disease within the hearts of the saints? We have yet to note how the 'rule of righteousness' prospered in Sion; how unchangeable are the laws of human development; how inexorable the judgments of history.

KARL PEARSON.

IS NOT ALL TRUE THEOLOGY SCIENTIFIC ?

NOT long ago I was permitted to listen to an essay in which a Minister discussed the question : " Can Theology be taught scientifically ? " with a view to determining his own conclusions as to University teaching of Theology. He himself, a gentleman of fine mind and truly scholarly culture, and of remarkable simplicity and earnestness of spirit, was unfeignedly anxious to establish the possibility of teaching Theology, in Schools open to all and honestly devoted to Learning for its own sake, upon those same bases of research, criticism, experiment, advancing insight and frank declaration of new views of what from time to time appears to be the Truth, which now happily underlie all genuine University education in Literature, History, and Mental and Moral Science, as well as in what are commonly called scientific subjects.

This branch of learning, like those, could surely be followed and developed in the interest and by the methods of unbiassed and progressive Love of Truth ;—so he believed.

But, my friend* was a member of that most respectable christian Society which, while claiming to be a champion of independent Association, commonly takes great pains to formulate an orthodoxy of its own, and to make those whose judgment that creed does not satisfy clearly understand that they are perfectly free—to go ; but cannot any longer be allowed to consider themselves as members of its fellowship of faith.

* A Congregationalist Minister. He afterwards said his first thought was the right one, and his argument fallacious.

He was, therefore, nevertheless, compelled to own that for the purpose of teaching Theological Students, it must not be forgotten that the interests of the particular Body amongst which such students would be preparing themselves to become Ministers, would necessarily require the inculcation of the Theology of that Body with its accustomed formulas and its regular series of arguments in support, and would with equal urgency prohibit all real and, possibly, hazardous discussion of the accuracy of those opinions or the sufficiency of that Apparatus. A religious Body did not want Theology in general, but its own particular view of such subjects.

Moreover, it was obvious that the success of the future Minister in his career, and even his livelihood, would depend very much upon his expounding as the great majority of his hearers would expect him to expound, and keeping himself and them clear of lines of thought or expressions, which they might find unfamiliar, and more or less disturbing or dangerous.

And further, there was the subscribing Supporter of the College to be considered. He would certainly make his disappointment heard, if his teaching staff did not turn out the article he wanted,—and paid for.

And indeed, how was the natural desire of the Body to increase its numbers and influence to be secured, if its trumpeters gave uncertain sounds?

He was therefore compelled to come to the conclusion that it was not possible to teach Theology like other branches of Learning.

Professors and pupils might pursue their studies of Criticism, History, and Psychology as they felt inclined, but "Theology" must be studied apart, and on lines of its own, with constant regard to prescribed schemes, and in short could not be studied scientifically.

The Denomination and its college were too near together, and their conjunction necessarily shut out light and truth!

The question was a grave one, but it did not receive any satisfactory answer,—because of the too habitual movement

and too contracted survey of the Minister, evidently suffering from constitutional orthodoxy.

Various points present themselves somewhat differently to an inquiring Layman, free from professional bias, or aims, or reputation, and since that discussion the following notes have taken shape.

Theology in its proper sense—a word about God—is thinking on religious subjects, and its reduction to exact expression. Religion is the subjective recognition of our relation to Divine things,—of the association of man with God,—and of spiritual regeneration, aspiration and satisfaction. Theology is the investigation of those matters and the statement in terms of acquisition and communication, of the truths regarding them, so far as our observation and reflection, that is to say, our insight and knowledge for the time being, extend. It includes the discernment and the study of what we apprehend, and the clear arrangement and enunciation of our thoughts and facts, arguments and conclusions, in such form that we ourselves may know what we know, and why; and may, in discourse with others, communicate our different lights to mutual advantage;—so that—to use honoured phrases—we may be persuaded in our own minds, may give reason for the faith that is in us, and may edify one another.

There is a so-called Theology which confines itself to illustrating the conclusions of bygone investigators, accepting their propositions, and bending its whole effort solely and deliberately to exhibiting them; or, at most, making no more adventurous attempt than to accumulate what it calls arguments for the demonstration of those foregone conclusions, while studiously debarring itself from any real questioning. This sort of Theology, moreover, is very apt to project its certainty as to what it has received, upon its unknown past of thought, and to admit under the names of Authority, or the Mind of the Church, or Revelation, or the

Word of God, peremptory conditions which refuse to Reason any place. With this cult of creeds, a very making and vending of images of Great Diana, after the pattern, of course, of that one which fell from Jupiter, our honest inquiry is not at all concerned. Based on dogmatic assumptions, and reserving its foundations from discussion, it is certainly not a true word, nor even the word of a lover of Truth. It seeks no better knowledge, and is characteristically unscientific. That is no true word about God which has ceased to be uttered after reverently seeking light upon the holy mountain, but which only vainly repeats before the curtain of some temple made with hands, its inherited professions and liturgies. Theology—the word about God and his Kingdom, his power, his glory—is not in the dictation of Book or Church, not in continuous choruses of chanting brotherhoods, but in thinking, in eager, advancing study, in hypotheses, in faith and trust in methods honestly followed out and watchfully amended, and in results which will hold till reverently displaced by better ones. Theology—true theology—is not finished, and set, and stiff—and dead; but ever fresh, and growing, and free, verily a living word, if ever any word is so.

As Theology means the word about God, so we may explain the term Scientific as meaning of the kind that makes to know.

Unfortunately, just now, the extraordinary proficiency of the age in the special field of physical nature has seriously narrowed the import of the great name of Science, to the progressive study of physical nature only, and we are distracted with babble and squabble about the conflict of Science and Religion, the incongruity of Science and Theology, and their several reconciliations and the like, and are pestered with the philosophic verbiage of the Agnostics, as if Religion and its discussion had not everything to do with progressive knowing. It is the fatuity of those who may perhaps know what they have learned, but don't know what they do not know. Science to them only means the study and declaration of what they can see and handle, and they doubt

Psychology and flout Theology. There are scientific men who, having found out the unsatisfactory nature of the pretentious theologies of the Churches, and having not yet discovered the truer way to God, deny the existence of any way, while others save themselves from this pit by keeping Science for their intellect, and refusing for it any entrance into the counsels of the Spirit;—blind leaders indeed, amongst too many blind, and at once falling and leading others into sloughs.

It is better done to maintain the older and truer meaning of *Scientia* as the state of knowing; not knowledge only of what has been learned and said, but the apprehending, and understanding, and explaining, by degrees, all about everything; and that, spiritual as well as physical, always reaching forward to a larger Knowledge about the Universum.

The Physicists have, however, so far as they have yet gone, perfected the scientific method, namely, accurate and corrected observation, watchful criticism, cautious and patient experiment, close, unbiassed reasoning, and humble renunciation of any conclusion on the discovery of error or new fact. They have shown the true scientific aim to be earnest prosecution of the search after more light and truer views of Truth and confident advance in Knowing. Their objects are necessarily contracted, and their calculus confined and essentially inapplicable to the subject of this essay. They cannot see except with their eyes, and know nothing of the higher spiritual senses. There can be no atomic theory of morals, no mechanical equivalent of Spirit. The child saw trees and flowers, but it shut its eyes when it "walked in God." It is faithfulness, however, within its province, to this conscience of thought that builds up the sciences of Mechanics and Chemistry, and Geology and Astronomy, and many another physical study. The same conscientiousness ever carries the matter further, and, combining these and other kindred sciences in one comprehensive view and deduction, will some day open the vistas of Cosmology,—the Science of the Created.

And Biology and Psychology, and History and Ethics,

pursued with less of material limitation, when we have reached proficiency enough, will blend in an intellectual Science of which Comte, the Confucius of a nineteenth-century Paris, has only dreamed.

And when the study of divine things has been, with still higher insight, faithfully pursued in the same earnestness, with the same care and the same openness of soul, a true Knowledge of the Spirit will take its own place, and for the first time Theology will rank with, and above, Cosmology and Philosophy.

And, then, with larger minds and purer hearts, we shall be a little nearer knowing what God means by man, and what man means by God;—and hereafter, if not in this embryotic world of ours, those who have reverently learned to unite the requisitions and the calculus of all these parts of knowledge will see before them, no matter how infinitely far in front, the all-embracing knowledge, which is the Light of the immediate presence of God.

Have we not under the impulse of the Spirit of knowing already exchanged the vanishing perspectives of certainty for an ever-widening outlook into space and time? Are we not, at this moment, peering eagerly into new worlds of Association and Mankind? Are we not already reverently exulting in the “breathings of eternity,” that release us for ever from the sensuous splendours and the wearying routine of the throne-room of Jehovah, from the crude imagery of a self-begotten God, and the faithless, hopeless slavery that the Churches mostly preach?

Our nature is characteristically capable of this pursuit; and, by the grace of God, our maker and preserver, because it is so capable, whenever a Seer sees with peculiar insight new and greater Truths, so often the discovery of one becomes the proper possession of all cultured people, be they chemists or coal-miners or electricians, or students of mythology or philology, or Chaldeans, or Jews, or Germans, or Cornishmen, or, for the matter of that, Mexicans or Esquimaux. So, as when an observer of nature or a student of subtler science recognises the flash of new light, the kindred

capacity for illumination in his disciples seizes the novel point and it is thenceforward the commonplace of all; in like manner, when the pure in heart has seen God, his very presence and the utterance of his vision lifts his people and his age out of the mists of wandering, and all see for always afterwards so much more of the Infinite in wisdom and goodness. In either case there is plainly an Inspiration and a Revelation; but in neither does the Light come except to the seers, or the Spirit except to the seekers; and these are men like all the rest of men, and speak what they understand; and what we can understand, and can follow out to new applications and new developments of our own,—all by that Reason which has been given to us for this very purpose.

And herein, what of authority? This may be the weight of testimony,—of the witness borne to facts by the ages past of human experience, or by the credibility of one trustworthy soul; in either case, a case of proof, acceptable and accepted by that same reason,—a genuinely scientific element in the acquisition of knowledge. In fact this sort of authority is often that of a truly observant or even experimental investigation. There is another authority, that asserted by Churches and Popes, great or little, bidding every neighbour and every brother "Know the Lord," always according to the peculiar dogma. If the lesson is the repetition of what everyone knows, say some truth of human nature or of conscience, or is one that approves itself to thoughtful consideration after free, frank, study, it will have its due weight, simply by the reasonable way of testimony and knowing,—not from the Church or the priest and their arrogant claims to dictate.

But what has any man, who faithfully exercises the powers he finds he has in him, to say for the instruction that is not so justified,—which Church and Pope require to be swallowed whole, and about which they will have no questioning, no thought, no investigation, no judgment, even repudiating any acceptance which assumes to be intelligent? Is any other knowledge attained, or really

attainable by acceptance of that kind? Surely not. Nor does the allegation of revelation help. A revelation, a dogma, is only acceptable upon the same testimony as other facts; not because a Church chooses to raise the fiction in order that it may stand upon it, or to keep repeating prayers that may have expressed a truth to some sometime, but have long since ceased to do so. Many persons have accepted a statement even about Jehovah only, that He wrote on two tables of stone that He had made. Do we?

And now as to the true Word about God, is it anything but of the kind that makes to know? Can it continue true, without increasing knowing?

How has it been? When some savage first raised his thought above his animal needs, and pondered as deeply as in him lay on the mystery of his rude life, and discovered in some suddenness, or some queerness, the solution of his difficulty, and learned to carry about and foster his fetish, and to shew the way of the higher life to his fellows, his elementary religion was the subject of a theology, elementary also, of course, but (as far as he could go) truth seeking, and truth following, and truth declaring, and absolutely and genuinely as scientific as it was essentially spiritual up to the measure of his day and his strength. Was that perception of the Fetish less truly a revelation to him than the message to the Prophet in Israel? Was that truth not for him Divine? God did not show Himself in either case, but led His child to discover what he could for himself. What had the man done but think it out with all his mind and all his soul? And as he prosecutes his study, and reverently follows his light to uglier and stranger comforters or medicines for the ills of fate, he continues his faithful search after the Truth, even to the mysteries of carnage or cannibalism. Too soon, alas! as in much more advanced communities, men find too much else to do to take trouble to work out the matter again for themselves, much less carry on the search; and they learn to be content with what has been told them. And then self-ordained

"priests" find their profit in the humanity which will worship whether it understands or not, and by degrees persuade even themselves of the sanctity of their "mumbo jumbo," and grow rich on fees and legacies, and their dupes pay them.

So that clear-headed old savage, who is said to be still living, now, in the midst of our England already priest-ridden for a thousand years, who, while she felt justified in charging Providence with unwise and even unfair treatment of her concerns, could still reassure herself by reckoning that "there was Them above as would look after he," had faithfully conducted her investigation of such things, and learned to look forward towards the Truth, and framed her word about God, true for her, according to her lights, by thinking the matter out for herself.

So the Aryan lover of Nature brooded over its variety and succession, and the many, and the all in one, with watchful observation and unwearied thought, ever passing on through learning and knowing to more light, till he too fell amongst priests, and his theology sank from words about God to rituals, and commentaries on commentaries on the hymns of old.

So the Chaldean astronomer ordained the constellations and the planets, and discovered their laws and the Creator and his ministers, and the strife-trained Bactrian puzzled out his Ormuzd and his Ahriman and all their hosts and their conflict, and the Victory of the Good, and the spiritual kinship of those who fight on the same side,—till each in his turn fell a prey to the professional interpreters, and manuals of witchcraft filled the arrow-headed page and magian rites overwhelmed purer enthusiasms.

The history of our own faith and truth runs on like lines. From Ur of the Chaldees came out the man who was called the friend of God. We know how his natural science nursed his spiritual discernment, and, together, they became his guide to Knowledge, and with Semitic insight Abraham solved one section of the question of Man and God, while man is man, so far as he went, and so far as we yet know.

But it has taken 4,000 years of persevering thought, the power of Moses, and the passion of David, and the wisdom of Solomon, and the fervour of Isaiah, and the love of Jesus, and the zeal of Paul, and the virtue of the Stoics, and the madness of the Crusaders, and the wrath of Luther, and the charity of Wilberforce, and the contributions of ten thousand other seers and prophets, and many a recasting of phrases, to work out the word about God *which is true for us now*. And many Another shall come before men may know what faithful seekers shall know hereafter.

So Hebrew prophets declared what they saw, and heard, and knew, continually opening fresh vistas of spiritual truth, elevating and purifying the conception of God, and discovering and revealing within their little tribe the laws of tendency towards association and union with the Infinite in existence and in wisdom and goodness.

So Indian sages have seen and declared the infinity and the variety of God as no others have ever done; and a Hindu moralist studied out, with surpassing devotion, the mysteries of desire and distress, and learned and taught to millions the way of renunciation to peace passing understanding.

So Jesus learned and taught his knowledge of the Fatherhood of God and the family on earth, and self-abandonment in duty—the way of love and the cross to holiness and death.

So the enlightened, having left behind alike the wilderness of self-regarding, and the mists or mirages of self-consciousness, owning their own littleness and ignorance, and opening, like the lilies, above the earth, in the pure glory of the light of the Infinite God, continually acquire and diffuse more knowledge of the perfectness of his presence, and the simplicity of his requirement, and, casting aside the imaginations of Nirvana and “the future life,” live in eternity from hour to hour, and trust the Truth, whatever it may be.

It may be true that the extraordinary riches of this world, for the yesterday that is now passing, have choked the word, and we are unfruitful. The night may have to come, and it may be reserved for those that come after us to see the day-

spring again ; but through all, as in the past so now, and for the future, this has been and is and will be our redemption. We *shall* go on, confidently, but ever more meekly, inquiring and learning and knowing and teaching more of the truth of God's everlasting Now. And ever again and again in the fulness of time the prophet of a larger and truer knowledge will come to call men up to a wiser goodness and a holier truth, a more absolute love, and more perfect communion.

We have eyes to see and must see.

So Paul studied and declared, and Augustine mused and repented and preached, ever forgetting the things behind, pressing forward towards the mark of their high calling.

So Wicliffe translated, and Priestley rationalised, and Wesley meditated, and Parker read, and severally spoke from the fulness of their minds and hearts.

And so every free and unfettered, reverent and self-forgetting seeker after God has striven, and will continue to strive to know and to show the truth as far as he sees it, according to his light, and still to seek more.

In spite of the besetting indolence of the generations of men, and their readiness to go on in the old grooves, and the continuance (until the day of judgment no doubt) of the professional Tares, with their forged credentials, and their arrogant pretensions, and their management or prohibition of the Scriptures, the covenant that the Lord made with the House of Israel still stands : " I WILL PUT MY LAWS " INTO THEIR MINDS AND INTO THEIR HEARTS, *and they* " *shall not teach every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, 'know the Lord,' but ALL SHALL KNOW* " ME FROM THE LEAST TO THE GREATEST."

It is the impudent orthodoxies of Churches that have ever closed the written and silenced the inner word—of Churches, that never seek to know more, or wish to see men learn Truth for themselves.

It is the Churches with their self-sufficient crystalisation that have ever persecuted the student of God in his works and every independent thinker ; always seeking to

drive men under the chattering formulas of routine into the hands of soul-destroying priestcraft. So, now, in this our own day, unthinking clergy—men who never try to see by the way of new knowing—are deliberately reviving the figures of former days, and, because they have no real word about God in their hearts, go abroad with all their ghastly make-believes of Ritualism, as Levite and Brahmin did and do; and priests commit enthronization in the courts of their Lord's house, and are not ashamed; and even Unitarian ministers, with a veritable perversion, organise the Denomination, and warn off the Syrophe-nicians; and people of weak faith dreadfully puzzle themselves how to make services of God "interesting."

The instinct of worship keeps the religious faculty alive whether men cherish Rome or the written word, or more simply seek God directly; but *they* give stones for bread who pass off the formulas of bygone ages, or indeed of themselves or this age, for the word about God of any other man.

Such formulas may have been—may be—true expressions for the thought of former or of present thinkers, such as it is; and they may be so for men who are of exactly the same culture as the thinkers dead or alive; but every man, if his theology is to be true for him, must see and learn and know for himself. It is by the truthfulness of that intention, or the truth of that continuous revelation, that we read now with a genuine sympathy and reverence the hymns of the Egyptians, or in a nearer descent repeat to-day the psalms of the Exile from our very hearts to the Christian's God, or renew the loving faith of Jesus before the less human but more glorious God whom we are beginning to try to know as the One who alone has Knowledge and Law, and who is Wisdom and Righteousness and Love and Help and ineffable Comprehension.

We may understand the divine operations better because men have lost themselves in the paradoxes of the Trinity or the controversies on the Eucharist, in which it is hard to think that any living soul can now take any real interest; but woe and death to us if we take the phrases of a former

knowledge, much more of puzzled persuasion, for finalities; the truth of doctrines for the truth for us, dishonourably resting in the labours of our forerunners instead of honestly labouring on as they did.

Others' view of truth cannot be true for us, as soon as we pass beyond their stage of culture and knowledge; and not to have done so is to sleep or to lie dead and decay.

As certainly as we are alive, and working on with all our heart and soul, with all our mind and strength, we must press forward, meekly sure of our imperfect power, and owning our limitations of insight, but honestly and faithfully and reverently seeking to see and know something more of the truth of all that lies beyond and above, and humbly trying to express our better word about God as we are made to know more.

And, while we are men, our methods are those of sacred intuition and truthful reason. By our very constitution we must observe and enquire, note, try, define, correlate, renew, correct, and advance, and speak out, continually, as in Chemistry, so also in Theology.

In one word, our word about God, our Theology, to be true, *must* take the path of seeking to know, which we call Scientific.

We must worship God in Spirit and in Truth, and there is no Life of Spirit that is not free and infinite, and no way of truth but the endless way of knowing.

And, after all, while Theology—false or true—is but as trifling and transitory as man and all his science,—enticing words of man's wisdom,—Religion needs only the soul's surrender to the Godhood around and above, and with or without Theology, THE PURE IN HEART SHALL SEE GOD.

R. D. DARBISHIRE.

A TRANSITION PERIOD IN FEMALE EDUCATION.

SO much has of late been said and written about the education of girls that one might feel disposed to regard the subject as exhausted and expect to find all problems connected with it either solved or in a fair way to solution, with the exception of such questions as the imperfection of human faculties renders entirely insoluble. But on attentive reflection, we perceive two or three retarding causes which prevent the formation of a clear and rational public opinion on the subject. In the first place, the spirit of partisanship,—that influence ever fatal to clear and consistent thought, though perhaps almost indispensable for vigorous action,—has invaded this field and complicated what was in itself no easy matter with all those burning controversies loosely classed together as belonging to the “woman question.” The political disabilities of women, their rights as holders of property, their admission to professions and public offices,—all these subjects have, of course, a certain bearing on that of female education, yet it is well, if possible, to keep them aloof while examining the matter in hand. Nay, the question of the equality or inequality of the sexes is often dragged into a discussion of the educational claims of women, where it is as much to the point as would be an investigation of the comparative merits of wheat and oats in a discussion on systems of irrigation. But party spirit does more than complicate the problem. It often leads those who take a sanguine view of the future of women’s education and social position to regard as cowards or as retrogrades those whose hopes are not unmingled with fears, and who see among the forces which are changing the old order of things some that

should be furthered as much as possible and others that need to be checked.

Again the question is kept from lucid discussion owing to a want of harmony between those whose interest in it is purely theoretical and those who regard it practically. Not that theorists do not show an interest in the actual movements of educational progress, or that practical teachers have not often wide and clear views as to the essential nature of education; still here as in other departments of life it is hard for the thinkers and the workers to meet on common ground, and it is no uncommon thing to find a thoughtful person well furnished with educational theories but totally ignorant of many of the great educational enterprises of the last few years; or, on the other hand, a capable teacher regarding with distrust if not with contempt the speculations of theorists on educational method. This remark applies still more to the education of girls than to that of boys by reason of the rapid strides now being taken in female education, with which the general public can scarcely be expected to keep pace, and also of the limited class of persons engaged in this particular work. Such being the case, it may seem not impossible that a person who has had some practical acquaintance with women's colleges and girls' high schools may be able, not indeed to sound the limits of the subject or to foretell the future progress of education, but to point out a few results of the changes which have taken place within the last few years, to warn against some rocks ahead, and to throw some light on the critical nature of the period through which we are passing.

Since, however, rapid changes are also being made in the education of boys and youths, it is desirable first to see how far the progress being made in the education of the two sexes is due to the same causes and tends to like results. The differences peculiar to modern education irrespective of sex may be divided into two classes, both of them due to the practical and scientific tendencies of the present day, viz., changes in subjects taught and changes in method of teach-

ing. The magnitude of the latter class of changes and their beneficial character must be admitted by every one who reads any modern work on educational method or discusses the matter with an experienced teacher. Of course the value of a good method may be and often is over-valued. In all ages a ready-minded and sympathetic teacher has been able to accomplish more on a very defective method than a mere routine worker with the best of theories and appliances. But for those who are neither "born teachers" nor hopeless dullards—and of this middle class the vast majority of workers must always be composed—it is surely a good thing to be brought to realise that there is such a thing as an art of education, and that if it is practised unsuccessfully the fault is at least as likely to be in the workman as in his material; that in teaching any subject whatever the gradual progress from simple to complex, and from concrete to abstract, may be made both a profitable and a pleasant mental exercise; and that dull scholars, so far from requiring a smaller share of good teaching than those who learn with facility, afford a field for the careful application of means which might elsewhere seem to be superfluous. Nor is it in changes of this kind that we find the chief differences of opinion. All good teachers may not be agreed on minor details of method, but their main principles are generally the same, and in so far as those principles have a definite psychological basis, we may expect to see them become more and more prevalent. In this field, too, not much difference is to be seen between the effects in boys' and those in girls' schools. But when we approach the other class of changes, those which relate to the choice of subjects to be taught, we find a wide divergency among educational thinkers of various types, and also some difference in the nature of the problem when transferred from the education of one sex to that of the other. We hear on many sides nowadays that too much time and trouble has in times past been spent in drilling boys in the elements of the dead languages, with which but few ever obtain sufficient familiarity to be able to use them as vehicles to a world of

literary culture. The practical mind of the modern Englishman is impatient of a system which seems to yield no fruits, and demands the admission into the curriculum of subjects of evident use in the world, particularly modern languages and the natural sciences. One subject after another has, as it were, fought its way to a place in the recognised curriculum of our public schools and universities. But the old system was too firmly established to be easily uprooted. Classics and mathematics had been for generations the sole subjects regarded as constituting a liberal education. Consequently they have not ceded their place as the main elements in the education of boys and youths, and the additional subjects admitted have taken a subordinate place and been regarded as extras rather than as the "staple," so to speak, of education. But with girls the case has been quite different. For centuries there has not been any "staple" of female education. Whenever any great intellectual movement has been going on, women have generally participated in the same mental food as the men. The cultivated ladies of the Renaissance were learned in Latin and Greek. Those of the days of the *Encyclopédie* studied the natural sciences. And in all past times, a woman with an exceptionally strong craving for knowledge would seek to satisfy it with whatever nutriment came most readily to hand, which was generally of the same kind as that which was being supplied to her brothers and male friends. The question of its adaptation to her needs was not considered any more than in the case of Aurora Leigh and her father:—

The trick of Greek

And Latin, he had taught me, as he would
Have taught me wrestling or the game of fives
If such he had known. . . .
He wrapt his little daughter in his large
Man's doublet, careless did it fit or no.

But setting aside exceptional periods of intellectual activity and exceptional individuals who could not be confined within conventional limits, the instruction given in girls'

schools has been, up to the revival of women's education within our own recollection, so slight and so superficial, that there cannot be said to have existed any subjects which furnished the substratum in the education of girls as classics and mathematics have long done in that of boys. Modern languages and music were generally supposed to be taught, but without method and thoroughness. The consequence is remarkable, and one not, perhaps, sufficiently estimated by those conversant with education:—the want of a consensus among teachers of girls and women as to what subjects should be taught, not merely as extras but as fundamentals, and resulting thence a wide variety in the curricula adopted in different schools and often a policy of fluctuation and of uncertainty in aim which is greatly to be deplored.

Historians have often dwelt upon the differences of constitutional development in England and in France. In England the advance has ever been "from precedent to precedent." Scarcely once has there been a serious breach of continuity. The constitution, like a living organism, has ever been readapting itself to altered conditions, its fundamental characteristics remaining the same. In France, on the other hand, the forms of popular liberty were lost early, and when the revolutionists took it upon themselves to frame a constitution, they had to fall back upon the rights of man. Now this comparison may not inaptly be transferred to the education of boys and that of girls in England. Whereas the progress in boys' education has been, as has just been said, comparatively steady and without revolutions, the leaders in the movement for improving the education of girls, finding no curriculum to adopt and readapt, have had to fall back on first principles, and consider in the first instance what subjects ought to be included in the education of an average woman. At first sight, this may seem to be advantageous for girls, in allowing them freedom from the tight bands of custom and prescription which hinder progress among boys. Macaulay, in the midst of his unloved study of trigonometry, bitterly congratulated his sisters that they

were free to direct their studies along the more congenial paths of literature. To the same purpose Adam Smith remarks, after complaining of the retarding influence of old foundations for the education of boys: "There are no public institutions for the education of women, and there is accordingly nothing useless, absurd, or fantastical in the common course of their education." Practical experience, however, shows that there is much to be said on the other side of the question. Rules laid down by our forefathers may be defective, but they are often better than the passing fancies and fashions of the present day. Routine may be dull and cramping to the powers, but it is at any rate better than anarchy. And that the present state of girls' education, so far as relates to the choice of subjects to be learnt, is altogether anarchical and chaotic, is a fact necessarily arising from the circumstances of the case.

It was said just now that in framing a course of study for girls, teachers have to set aside tradition and have recourse to first principles. But in point of fact few are agreed as to those principles, and many seem to doubt their very existence. Some peculiar difficulties in finding and applying them are inherent in the nature of the problem as it now stands. For where the leaders in the movement have been men, it is almost unreasonable to demand from them that practical and accurate knowledge of the needs and capacities of girls for which the noblest purpose and the widest culture cannot furnish an equivalent. When, on the other hand, the work of reorganising the system has fallen to women, those women, merely by not having themselves enjoyed that thorough and wide education which they are endeavouring to secure to future generations, are scarcely capable of arriving at a certain and sound conclusion. Add to this fact the mass of prejudice which the reformers have to encounter from parents of pupils and from the general public—the British impatience for results, which can often be held in check by reverence for an old-established routine, but seldom by respect for scientific theory—and it will be admitted that a restless and unsatisfactory transition stage must

be a necessary preliminary to a stable and consistent settlement.

But just at the time when the difficulties of the question "What ought girls to learn?" were first making themselves seriously felt, a partial solution was afforded by our universities, in throwing open to girls those local examinations which had for some time been exercising considerable influence on a large class of boys' schools. Since they have become popular, those examinations have had more power in establishing a system of instruction in girls' schools than they could ever have among boys. For whereas the leading public schools for boys have not required this kind of examination, but left the benefits of it to the lesser public and the private schools, among girls, as a rule it is the public schools of the highest grade that have generally furnished a large proportion of the candidates. And the unsettled, loose state of girls' education made it ready to flow into any mould that was presented by sufficient authority. But though the influence of the local examinations on girls' schools has been powerful both for evil and for good, it did not finally determine the choice of subjects which should form the chief elements in the education of girls, since their object is to test knowledge in the subjects presented for examination, not to prescribe a routine, and considerable latitude is left to those preparing pupils for examination as to the relative stress which may be laid on the different subjects taken, the points which may be made strong, and the additional matter which may be cursorily acquired in the hope of gaining a few more marks or escaping a failure. Let us glance for a moment at the different kinds of curriculum which, even within the limits imposed by the university local examinations, may be, and actually are adopted by teachers of various capacities and tastes.

One plan on behalf of which much might be said is to make no difference, at least during school years, between the instruction of girls and that of boys, to ground them well in the elements of classics and of mathematics, the primary requisites for a literary and for a scientific education

respectively. For after all, the female mind is not essentially different from the male. Some processes of reasoning may generally be easier to one sex or to the other, but there is no way by which women can acquire sound knowledge save by patience and accuracy in apprehending and in retaining truth, qualities which are likely to be promoted in similar ways among boys and among girls. But such a scheme is beset with difficulties. Setting aside one that is entirely temporary, the difficulty at present of finding a sufficient number of mistresses well trained in classics and mathematics, we come to the more serious drawback that there is a great danger at present of putting a severer strain upon girls than their physical strength is able to bear. True, a healthily-trained girl has often a great deal of mental and nervous force, and if only thoroughly sound methods of instruction were adopted, that force might be greatly economised. Still, every one who has had much practical acquaintance with girls knows their tendency to overstrain their powers not so much by work as by worrying themselves over their work when the tasks set them require strenuous exertion. Very few have that power of throwing aside all thought of work during the time of recreation which is observed in the average school boy. True, as the physical culture of girls improves, this difficulty may be partly or wholly removed, but our practical concern is with the state of things at the present day. And when we remember that a number of small demands of a domestic nature are constantly made on the time of a girl, and that public opinion, perhaps rightly, demands of her more acquaintance with music and the other arts than is expected from her brothers, we must acknowledge that it is unreasonable to require girls to learn all that boys learn, plus a good deal which, whether well or ill-taught, has been demanded from the women of previous generations. An intelligent girl's powers of brain and nerves are like an elastic band. They often seem capable of bearing a great strain for some years and then suddenly and unexpectedly collapse. The consideration, likewise, of the rapid changes taking place in the

education of boys, which are tending to alter the old routine in many ways, may make us hesitate to adopt voluntarily a heavy burden, which, when imposed by necessity, may sometimes be found a useful ballast.

A second plan is to make the more important part of a girl's education consist in a training in English language and literature. Those who know how to teach these subjects in a thorough and at the same time a lively manner find in them an excellent means of drawing out the mental powers of pupils, of leading them to observe and to remember and of awakening a power of criticism and original thought. They also yield a much speedier harvest of intellectual wealth than those harder studies which involve years of drudgery before the pupil is able to discern any relation in them to his own daily life of thought and action. For those whose early education has been neglected and who have no time to make up past deficiencies, it is certainly more profitable to learn to appreciate Shakspeare and Milton, than to spend an equal amount of time in toiling at Greek and Latin grammar without a hope of being able ever to read Virgil or Homer with ease and pleasure. On the other hand, for the large and continually increasing class of young women who have both leisure and intellectual taste such as to make them capable of receiving a thorough literary or scientific education, such a curriculum is manifestly insufficient. Their whole mental career is hindered by a want of training in those elements which are best acquired in youth, while the verbal memory is most tenacious, and the critical faculty as yet undeveloped. To them it will seem that their school training has been of little value, if it has merely supplied them with the kind of knowledge which they would else have obtained for themselves in the intervals of graver studies, if it has been devoted to stimulating their intellectual desires rather than to supplying their intellectual needs. And again, where such a plan is pursued, where English studies are made all-in-all, and classics, mathematics, and science are only admitted as unnecessary luxuries, as time and occasion serve, the good

to be derived from these latter subjects is reduced to a minimum. For it is quite impossible that even Latin and elementary mathematics should be taught with any real advantage unless a much larger portion of the scholar's time is devoted to them than has hitherto been the case in most girls' schools. A merely superficial study, such as is represented by a weekly lesson requiring an hour's preparation, is most likely to breed either a vain confidence in attainments which are not really possessed or an equally ungrounded belief in the superiority of mental power in boys proportionate to their superior knowledge of the subjects which form the groundwork of their education.

Very similar arguments might be brought both for and against the plan of using modern foreign languages as the principal part of the intellectual training of girls. If these are well taught, they may both help in forming habits of accuracy and furnish the keys to wide fields of literature. But for those who aim high, they can never take the place of classical languages, especially as a really scientific study of any Romance language presupposes an acquaintance with Latin, for want of which the knowledge obtained is often superficial and valued rather on account of its practical than of its educative use.

There is, however, a worse method than any of these three, which teachers, distracted by the arguments of rival theorists and the demands of impatient parents, are sometimes tempted to adopt. This is, not to elevate any subject to the paramount position held by classics and mathematics in the education of boys, but to divide a tolerably equal portion of time to each of the subjects which are commonly contained in the curriculum of a liberal education. The result must be that almost everything is taken in a scrambling and superficial way. Where the pupils are prepared for examinations, those subjects encroach in which the candidates are expected to pass or to obtain distinction. The rest are taken up as soon as one examination is over, and dropped as the time of the next approaches, and so no satisfactory progress in them can be made. The minute

subdivision of time and the continual changes lead to distraction of mind, and are totally preventive of calm and steady work. And if any girls are really able for a time to work vigorously at a multitude of subjects at once, in order to offer them at a local examination, the strain they undergo is probably injurious both to body and mind.

The want of thoroughness, of concentration, and of calm which results from the practice of studying too many subjects at once is very frequently complained of among those interested in the education of girls. The worst dangers might be avoided by adopting a principle which an eminent public schoolmaster has called "stratification of studies." If the subjects taught—with the exception of some which are hardly capable of such treatment—were alternately during a year or a shorter period of time made the principal or the sole work of a class, the pupils would be enabled to obtain a firmer grasp of them, and the danger of forgetting what had been learned might be met by judiciously arranged recapitulatory work. Such a method seems particularly applicable to the study of modern languages and of history. The minds of children who have to learn several languages at once become hopelessly confused and they often come to the end of their schooldays without having a practically useful acquaintance with any. The history taught in schools often amounts to no more than the amount of English history contained in a dry text-book which is gone through every year, and teachers complain that if there is only time for one lesson per week in the subject they really cannot attempt to secure such a minute and thorough study as could make the pupils feel a genuine and intelligent interest in their work. But if for one term of the three history were made an important subject, and an hour or two daily devoted to it, there would be time to work in detail through a course of books on the history of some country or of some notable period in many countries, and the insight gained would more than compensate for any neglect of the subject during the two remaining terms. Similarly with regard to mathematics:—

if no algebra were taught till the pupils had a fair knowledge of arithmetic, and if when it were begun, all work at arithmetic were dropped for a while, to give as much time as possible to algebra, far more rapid and satisfactory progress would probably be made in the elements of the subject, which are sometimes found to be an entire mystery to girls who have been devoting a small portion of time to them year after year. Unfortunately, this plan of "stratification" would be thought not likely to pay in the Local Examinations, and therefore we have little hope of seeing it adopted. If a girl takes a local examination every year, she must still go the annual round of English history, of arithmetic, of the various languages. Even under these circumstances, however, improvements might be made if parents and teachers had some architectonic idea in education—if less were left to haphazard—if the last terms of a girl's school life were not taken up with work that is introductory to subjects she never means to study—if examinations were made the test of work rather than work the preparation for examinations. The enlightened efforts of educational workers and thinkers are almost certain in the long run to overcome the tendency to "cram" and to superficiality. But meantime, in this period of transition, the evils are manifest to all who are acquainted with the work done in girls' schools.

But it is of little good, by a process of negative criticism, to point out the faults to be found in most of the modern tentative system of girls' education, unless we are able to delineate, however generally and roughly, the lines along which we may hope to discover suggestions and hints of some more satisfactory course. If education be really an art based on scientific principles, not a mere practical process regulated by dogmatic precepts and empirical rules,—if the educator, like any other true artist, cannot perform his task aright without understanding whither his labours are tending,—we can only hope for light on the subject by going back to the preliminary question: What is the object of the school education given to girls? For the sake of

simplicity we will consider here chiefly intellectual education, and leave aside all questions relating to moral and physical training except in so far as they bear upon that of the mind.

Now the object of education is acknowledged by all parties to be this—to prepare the pupil for the duties of his or her future life. But great mistakes will be made if we give too narrow an interpretation to this principle. It is not the purpose of a liberal education—we are not speaking here of technical instruction—to teach the means by which the duties of life are to be performed in all their details. Its aim rather is two-fold—in the first place to train the mind in such a way that it will readily apprehend and steadily follow the best course in the business of life whenever the time for taking up that business actually arrives; and in the second place, to create such tastes and habits as may lead to a pleasant and profitable use of leisure time, without which all work is likely to degenerate into a mechanical and unintelligent routine. By this consideration it is easy to refute those who would argue that as the principal work of most women relates to domestic and family affairs, therefore instruction in domestic work, in cookery, needlework, the management of children and similar matters, ought to hold a prominent place in the curriculum of a girls' school. What an ordinary girl might expect to learn at school is not how to manage a household,—for instruction in such matters can hardly be given at school,—but how to be able to turn herself intelligently to the thorough performance of domestic duties when the school days are over, and how to nourish her mind and develop her energies in the intervals of such duties so that she may be a thoughtful and vigorous worker, not a mere machine and household drudge. Similar principles are to a certain extent acknowledged in boys' schools wherever an attempt is made to differentiate those who are preparing for different kinds of life. On the modern side of public schools there is not much taught as to the details of commercial life, nor on the classical side are those destined to be doctors, lawyers or

clergymen instructed in those particular matters with which they are in the future to be most conversant. But each class is supposed to receive the education that will prepare best for the course of life to be adopted if those faculties are trained which will be most in requisition and those tastes formed which are likely to receive satisfaction.

To return to girls' schools: When the present time of transition is passed and the method which has been found fittest has alone survived, we may hope that the education of girls will be of a kind to develop those capacities and tastes which are desirable in a woman's life. Here, however, a great difficulty arises from the impossibility of determining, in the case of most girls, the walk of life which they will have to follow. If all women married, if they all married men of their own station in life, and if they each had families of an equal size, the case would be different, but at present it is quite impossible to know, or even to guess with any approximation to probability, the kind and amount of work which will be expected from any girl after she has grown to womanhood, or the amount of time which will be at her disposal for indulging her intellectual tastes. While the difference between the life of a woman whose duties are entirely or chiefly domestic and of one who has to earn her bread or to carve out her career by the power of her own hand and brain call for a differentiation of education at least as strongly marked as is that between the modern and the classical side in boys' schools, it is quite impossible, during a girl's school time, to be certain which kind of education she ought to receive, and there must always be a risk of wasting time, energy, and money in imparting instruction which if not valueless—for no subject in the world can be taught well without some benefit to the learner—is at any rate of considerably less practical value than some other kind of knowledge which might perhaps have been acquired with greater facility and at less expense.

If then we state that the only good education for girls is one that fits them for their duties in life and that it is impossible to tell what those duties will be till after their educa-

tion is completed, we seem to take a pessimistic view of the whole subject. Yet unless the facts to which we are calling attention are fairly faced, no rational solution of the problem can be reached, for those difficulties will not be apprehended which must always be a serious obstacle to the admission of women in large numbers to professions which require a long and costly preparation. Here, however, we are concerned only with liberal, not with technical education, and with the practical question as to how girls should be trained at school, while it is as yet uncertain whether their duties in life will be chiefly of a domestic or of some other character.

For young girls—up to the age of thirteen or fourteen—the case presents not much difficulty. For the preliminary training in quickness of observation, accuracy of reasoning, and clearness of expression which should be given in the lower forms of girls' schools are equally desirable in all possible walks of life, and probably it would be best that up to the age mentioned all boys and all girls in schools above the primary grade should be taught the same subjects, those namely which are found by experience the best means for imparting the training required. When, however, girls reach the age of about fourteen, it seems as if some distinction should be made according to individual wants and capacities. A little reflection will make this evident. Let us consider what tastes and capacities need to be developed in a girl of fourteen, of average abilities, of the middle class, who has two or three more years of school life and will subsequently devote herself to the tasks of a wife and mother. Plainly, it is not desirable to make her give all her time to study of a kind that is certain to be entirely neglected after she has left school. Suppose that she is taught enough Greek and Latin to be able with difficulty to construe an easy author and also something of the higher mathematics. It is extremely improbable that she will derive any advantage from such studies beyond the mental exercise which she might as easily have gained in some other way. Not that domestic life is so engrossing as to afford no time or oppor-

tunity for intellectual pursuits, but it is essentially a life of details, and as such demands a mind not so absorbed in intellectual work or devoted to abstract considerations as not to be ready at any moment to drop the thread of its meditations that it may throw all its energy into some slight practical work. There is much truth in the old saw that "Man works till the set o' the sun, But a woman's work is never done." A woman who is at the head of a household and superintends herself all the small matters which go to make up the health and happiness of family life cannot, like her husband, throw herself heartily after the close of her day's work into some absorbing intellectual pursuit. If she allows her mind to be engrossed by science or philosophy or the higher kind of literature, she is liable to find herself in the position of Plato's cave-born man who was brought into the sun-light and then restored, with eye-sight bleared and dazed, to his former dwelling—with the difference that in her case there would be no hope of recovering her sense of sight, with an increased power, after habitual sojourns in the upper air.

Must we say then that for domestic women—who form the large majority of our female population—no advantages are to be expected from improvements in the education of girls? Such is very far from being our opinion. In fact it is perhaps these women more than any other class that we hope to see benefited thereby. The preliminary mental training given to all young girls will have cleared their minds and rectified their power of judgment, and from the training given during the last years of their school life we may expect them to derive the power of enjoying real intellectual pleasures in their scattered moments of leisure. For them the principle may be laid down that those studies will be most beneficial which give the highest culture at the least expense of intellectual labour. And as modern languages, English literature, and social science and history as popularly treated seem to fulfil these requirements better than the classical languages, or the exact sciences, we may expect and desire that they should ordinarily form the principal part, if not the whole of the

instruction given to girls of average abilities and in ordinary circumstances in the highest forms of girls' schools.

But there are other women whose claims ought not to be neglected—those who have to earn their living in some independent way, and those who have strong intellectual tendencies which lead them to seek for a more thorough literary or scientific training. To these, good schools should afford such facilities for acquiring proficiency in different branches of knowledge as may fit them for benefiting to the full by a university education, and make them competent to start on their intellectual course as fully equipped as a well-trained public school boy. As time goes on and the preliminary requisite of a good elementary training becomes universal, we may expect to find an increasing number of women who study the same subjects as men and pass on to the universities, though it is probable that it will never become customary for women who do not intend to enter a profession or who have not decided intellectual tastes, to take up a university course.

But to return to our previous difficulty: How are these classes to be differentiated at school? The differentiation can certainly not be perfect, and much must be left to individual tastes and the pressure of circumstances. But probably the final result will be that in the better class of girls' schools we shall find in the upper forms a certain number working at classics and mathematics in preparation for a university career and for some profession, particularly that of teacher, and a large number studying chiefly modern languages, history, and literature, with no views beyond that of stimulating and partly gratifying those intellectual tastes which will make them cultivated women.

The results which will follow from the changed system of things are certain to be great, and may afford an ample field for curious speculation. There is probably very little ground in the fears of some timid conservatives lest the spread of higher education should render women unfit for household pursuits. As was said just now, the elementary training given to girls cannot but make them fitter for the perform-

ance of any duties which fall to the lot of rational beings. Also a certain amount of literary culture will make them more refined in their choice of recreation and more fitted for performing adequately their social duties. Entire absorption in scientific or metaphysical studies of a character to call away the attention from practical matters is likely to be found in a very small minority of women. It may be that the fancy of such a possibility has arisen from the fact that till but a few years ago only women of exceptional character and tastes had been able to acquire any culture worth the name, and those who failed to apprehend the nature of the transition period through which we are passing have judged of the rank and file from the pioneers of the cause. Feminine nature is not likely to lose all power of asserting itself, whatever changes may be made in education. And if it be allowable to refer to personal experience, the present writer has been surprised to see how, in a large girls' school, strong domestic proclivities, shown especially in love of children, skill in needlework, and interest in the little things of home, were most noticeable in girls who were foremost in the intellectual work of their classes.

One result which we may confidently expect to see after the time of transition is past is the disappearance from social life of a somewhat picturesque and amusing figure,—the clever woman who has had no education. So clever a woman as Ethel Newcome, for instance, innocently asking "Who was Helen?" will become an impossibility, and cultivated men will no longer be delighted by the naïve questions of women who are quick to seize upon some points of an intellectual conversation but unable to comprehend any important question in all its bearings. Such a loss to society will not be great, and will be more felt by the male than by the female sex. But there is another figure we shall be far more reluctant to miss,—that of the self-educated woman who has striven against a mass of difficulties to attain a certain standard of intellectual culture, and who serves the cause of knowledge with a far simpler and purer devotion than do any, whether women or men, who have had their

mental food prepared and seasoned for them without much effort on their own part and whose work has generally been stimulated by the hope of prizes and honours and the fear of disgrace. It were idle indeed to regret that obstacles are being removed out of the way of the many because of the diminished lustre of the characters of the few who were able to surmount those obstacles, and until a royal road to learning has been made there is no fear lest there should be want of scope for the energies of eager students. Yet perhaps there is a real danger lest among girls and young women those who are capable of strong intellectual work stimulated by pure love of learning should suffer mental and moral degradation by being led to regard the means rather than the end,—to think more of the prize to be gained or the place to be won in a class-list than of the studies which examinations and prizes are intended to direct and to encourage. The spirit of competition is in all our schools and universities a strong enemy to the disinterested desire for knowledge, quenching that desire in all minds but those of the finest calibre, and transforming all the serious work of a young person's life into one vast game of skill. The dangers attendant on the system of the university local examinations, the tendency they produce to study in a scrambling way, from paltry motives and without scientific method, has been already touched upon, and we may add that the excuse made for excessive competition in the case of boys,—the plea of necessity,—is generally inadmissible in that of girls. It is very seldom that with them recourse must be had to this method for selecting some candidate for a post requiring intellectual qualifications, and most teachers will probably agree that girls can be made to work more readily than boys without the stimulus of excessive competition, and that owing to the sensitiveness and proneness to anxiety generally found in intelligent girls such an influence is extremely detrimental to them, physically, mentally, and morally.

One danger of which we hear much—that of overwork—belongs especially to the transitional character of the education now given to girls. When a general consensus

of opinion has been arrived at as to what subjects are necessary to the education of an ordinary woman, the present hurry and strife may be mitigated and our aims adapted to possibilities. In the meantime a most fortunate accident—if such it can be called—has occurred to militate against any tendencies to overwork connected with the higher education of women,—I refer to the coincidence of that movement with two others, one towards a revival of art, the other towards physical culture. The invention of lawn-tennis has come at a most opportune moment for women and girls now that the additional strains put upon their intellectual powers need to be counterbalanced by abundance of physical exercise and fresh air. The revival of art too, and especially of art in the house, however much the movement may be degraded by its fanatical votaries and by those who find it fashionable to imitate them, has opened up for women another sphere of thought and action which prevents them from restricting themselves too narrowly to the field of books, and from neglecting the culture of the emotions for that of the intellect.

Perhaps it is possible to overestimate the future consequences to society of the spread of education among women, for many of the mental and moral qualities peculiar to one sex are the result of natural causes, and can be modified but not entirely abolished. Nevertheless those consequences are of considerable magnitude, and the extent to which they will be beneficial depends in great measure on the growth of a sound public opinion among cultivated people during this time of transition. To secure to all girls a sound preliminary training that may prepare for any course to be taken up subsequently, to give to those who need and desire it as complete a training in science or literature as can be obtained by men, to afford to those who have less leisure or capacity for intellectual labour such a degree of culture as may give a variety and beauty to life without any waste of power, to steer between excessive competition on the one hand, and vague desultoriness on the other,—the Scylla and Charybdis

90 A TRANSITION PERIOD IN FEMALE EDUCATION.

of education,—to adapt the kind of instruction⁴ given to the length of time passed at school and to the probable requirements of after life ;—these are some of the problems set before the promoters both of the higher education of women and of the sounder education of girls, and any step towards their solution will be a service rendered to the society of the future.

Alice Gardner.

PROTESTANTISM IN GENEVA.

A GOOD deal has been said lately, on more than one occasion, by the English press, about Geneva, its Protestantism and its Churches. There was an excellent article on the subject in the *Contemporary Review* of August, 1882, by Canon Fremantle; it was brought up in connection with the adventures of the Salvation Army in Switzerland; and more recently it was discussed by the *Spectator* of July 14 and September 29. These latter articles, appearing in an influential journal, were calculated to cause a harsh judgment to be passed on the people of Geneva.

In order to appreciate the real character of a country, however small it may be, it is not enough, as we well know, to have a more or less accurate acquaintance with certain public events, and certain legal enactments; we must also be familiar with its past, with its ideas and its customs; we must have lived amongst its inhabitants, have observed them and talked with them, and so have come to perceive the inner causes of the movements of its public life.

Above all, it is necessary to have the desire and purpose of being just, and to infuse into criticism that measure of good-will which is essential to strict justice.

The writer of the present article will constrain himself to maintain a position of impartiality, so far as that is possible to a man who sees his country and his Church unfairly treated. He will confine himself to repelling the accusations which, in his eyes, are unfounded and even unjust.

May we be allowed to remark, at the outset, to our English readers, whose good-will we set great store by,

that the little country of Geneva has certainly some claims on the sympathy of great England? Christians who are interested in the cause of Protestantism in the Latin countries, the friends of liberty, so numerous in England, will not think it out of place if we remind them of the claims which Geneva has on their interest. This city, with its narrow bounds, has been for a long time the asylum, the home, the school of Protestantism, in the French-speaking countries, struggling incessantly for two centuries against the superstitions, and in the 18th century against the coarse or mocking unbelief, which prevailed in France. During the whole of her difficult existence as a small sovereign republic she has with remarkable ability and tenacity valiantly maintained the independence which has been continually endangered, but has been protected by that Providence which watches over every sacred trust, and keeps inviolate the refuge of noble causes. She has elaborated in a workshop, of limited area, but always in activity, through many internal struggles and by an honourable but often perilous initiative, the principles and the practice of the political liberalism, and afterwards of the democracy which have established themselves in the heart of the great nations. We may be permitted to add—*si parva licet componere magnis*—that a marked analogy has often been observed between the Genevan character and the English, as in the sense of duty and of justice, the taste for the natural sciences, personal independence, the critical spirit, an aptitude for business and finance, seriousness, reflection and a strong will.

Again, numerous mutual relations have been established between Geneva and England ever since the 16th century. Exiles from the persecution of Mary Tudor formed here a Protestant community, which left us when Elizabeth came to the throne. Knox had been a pupil of Calvin. From a distance, Protestant England proved itself the friend, if not the protectress, of the little republic, surrounded as it was by menacing Catholic powers. She gave a welcome to a number of distinguished citizens of Geneva, and even found

a place for them at court, or in military or ecclesiastical offices, or in the honours conferred by her associations. Two Casaubons were dignitaries of the Church; four Prevosts and others distinguished themselves as superior officers in the army; our three most eminent theologians in the eighteenth century were made members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Benedict Pictet, J. A. Turretini, and Jacob Vernet, and they kept up a friendly epistolary correspondence with the archbishops of Canterbury in their day. Numerous Genevan pastors have served the Churches of refuge in Great Britain. Between 1750 and the present date, there have been no less than fifteen Genevan savants who have belonged to the Royal Society of London. Delolme, Sir Francis d'Ivernois, Mallet-Dupan are publicists who have served the Liberal cause in England, while making its constitution and politics better known on the Continent. The two brothers Marc-Auguste and Charles Pictet, quite at the end of last century, founded at Geneva the *Bibliothèque Britannique* (which still exists under the name of the *Bibliothèque Universelle*), in response largely to English ideas in the French-speaking countries. A number of our scholars have been students in the universities of Scotland; a still greater number of our merchants and financiers have gone into business in London, Manchester, and Liverpool. On the other hand, many illustrious Englishmen, princes, lords, savants, both before and after Lord Byron, have stayed for pleasure on the borders of our lake, and have even taken—which is more than the poet did—a practical interest in our public life. Two international institutions of which England had the benefit, were born in this narrow cradle, the Convention of Geneva and the Red Cross, in 1864, and, in 1872 the Tribunal of Arbitration in international disputes, which dealt with the affair of the *Alabama*.

At the present day we have an English colony and an American colony settled permanently among us, and held in much esteem. Two chapels, that of the Anglican Church and that of the American Episcopal Church are open for

their religious uses ; in summer a service is held for the Scotch in the Cathedral, and in another place there is one for the non-episcopal Americans. One important English journal, the *Continental Times*, is issued from our press ; and the professor of English Literature at the University, Mr. Robert Harvey, has taken pleasure in contributing to it a series of interesting articles, the object of which is to set forth the relations between the country of his birth with that in which he holds his professorship. As to the young Genevese who go over to England to make their fortune, they soon feel *at home*, and on the Continent we are very ready to accuse them of Anglo-mania.

Such are, in brief abstract, the claims, out of proportion perhaps to her small dimensions, which Geneva may establish on the justice, not to say on the interest and the goodwill of the English Press. If your readers bear them in mind, they will be less disposed to lend an ear to any rash and harsh judgments on this city. We cannot characterise in any other terms those to which no less distinguished a journal than the *Spectator* commits itself when it uses the following expressions in writing of Geneva :

... the conclusion, which has long been patent to local observers, that the Protestant Rome has become the most Free-thinking of European cities, and the Church founded by Calvin the least Christian of Churches. . . . People are sinking into a condition of cynical indifferentism. They not only believe that there is no truth in religion ; they doubt if there be truth in anything ; look upon belief as the mark of an inferior understanding—&c., &c.

There are other foreigners who have observed us more closely, or for a longer time, and have declared, on the contrary, that this city is one of those in which religion has most influence in animating men's minds and hearts, in nerving their arms and opening their purses. Indeed, this belongs to its tradition, handed down from age to age ; and it is not possible to imagine that the empire of such a tradition could vanish away and leave no trace behind.

Let us give a mere glance at the past. From the time of the Reformation to that of the Revolution, and to the annexation to France in 1793, all the citizens took an oath of fidelity to the Gospel. The closest relations united not only the two organisms of the Church and the State, but also Religion and the Nation, witness the history of public education in the schools, the college and the academy, and that of public morality in the sumptuary laws. The Company of Pastors had the surveillance in the domain of ideas, of instruction and of the press; the Consistory in that of manners; while the Government was over both. The annual fête of the *Promotions*, so-called, was a fête at once of the College and the Academy, of Science and of the Church. All the Councils, all the political elections, were opened by prayer or religious discourses pronounced by ecclesiastics, and the citizens could not separate in their affections things which were inseparable in the public customs—faith and one's country. There is, therefore, no cause for surprise in the phenomenon—by no means an altogether common one—that all the savants and literary men of Geneva of the 18th century made profession of religion, and that several of them were even apologists of Christianity. We will not do more than cite the names of Le Clerc, Mdlle. Huber, Cramer, Calandrini, Abauzit, Dr. Tronchin, De Luc, Charles Bonnet, Trembley, Lesage, De Saussure, Necker, the minister of Louis XVI.; not to mention the pastors who were the secretaries of Mirabeau,—Etienne, Dumont, and Reybaz. I do not except Rousseau, the only one of the philosophers of his time in France who zealously undertook—in his own way, of course—the defence of Christian spiritualism. The profound impression produced by this education of the mind and character by the Bible, by preaching, and by noble Christian examples, was not effaced by the Revolution, in the very heart of which Christian voices were heard without opposition, nay even with applause, at the national fêtes. This impression remained through the period of the French rule; it has survived the introduction of a certain number of Catholic

communities, Savoyards, and French; it has not disappeared, we assert, although it may have been weakened by a considerable immigration of foreigners (of a very different kind from that of the time of the Refuge) under the democratic régime initiated by the Revolution of 1846.

The influence of Christianity to-day, although sometimes contested or partially eclipsed, is still the one that is the most strongly felt in Geneva, both in social life and by the majority of the people. We make this assertion boldly, and we shall confine ourselves to the brief statement, in its support, of a few characteristic facts which show the set of public opinion.

1. If, in the first place, we refer to the political journals which represent the two parties—conservative-liberal and radical-liberal—the *Journal de Genève* and the *Genevois*, neither the one nor the other ever attacks religion; and both of them, since the vote on the separation of Church and State, in 1880, have insisted on its traditional importance in the land and its utility in public life. Their two weekly literary contributors are two distinguished ecclesiastics—one of them a Professor in the faculty of Protestant Theology in Paris; the other a Professor in the faculty of liberal Catholic Theology at Berne. The *Tribune*—a journal of news and business, which does not represent any particular party—is openly favourable to religion. Of course I leave out of the question here the religious journals properly so called.

2. Let us look at the department of instruction. Up to the year 1834 it was partly under the direction of the Protestant clergy. Since then, and especially after the revolution of 1846, and the reconstruction of the staff of the Academy by the new radical government, a certain number of men entered it who were strange to the traditions of this ancient institution and even to religion itself. At a later period when the Academy was transformed into a University, still more notable additions were made to its staff. There are at this moment seventy-three professors and

privat-docents in the University. We know personally a good half of them who as individuals or as fathers of families, have given in one way or another pledges of attachment either to evangelicism or to liberalism, and we should be very sorry to say that the others are opposed to the Christian belief. Those who are in open opposition might be counted on the fingers.

3. It is proper to mention here the public and free courses of Lectures, in the great hall of the University, which were founded in 1855 at the suggestion of M. Carteret, and which we may be permitted to say are worthy of admiration and imitation. The government offers to the public every evening (except Sunday) for five weeks before and five weeks after the beginning of the new year, a series of lectures or addresses, on all kinds of subjects, by the most competent men in the city or from elsewhere. Not one can be mentioned which has been directed against religion, —the government indeed would not allow it—and a good many of them have treated, if not of dogma, at least of the history of religions or of some particular period in the history of the Church. Many ecclesiastics have been invited to take part in these courses; and amongst seventeen lecturers in the programme for 1883-4, there are no less than four of them to be found. Other public free lectures, addressed specially to working-men, are supported by a fund left to the city of Geneva by P. Bouchet, and the course was begun by Lessons from the lives of the great physicists who have been religious men.

4. If we pass in review the savants, the literary men and the artists of this century who have belonged to Geneva, we shall notice that most of those who have gained an extended renown have given evidence of their attachment to Christianity. We need but name among the savants, the physicist Aug. de la Rive, the naturalist F. J. Pictet, the doctors Gosse and Rilliet, and General Dufour; amongst the men of letters, de Sismondi, Mme. Necker de Saussure, Töpffer, Sayous, the brothers Cherbuliez, Adolphe Pictet, A. Rilliet, H. F. Amiel, R. Rey, the poets Petit-

Senn, A. Richard, H. Blauvalet: amongst the artists, the painters Calame, Humbert, Hornung. To these we may be permitted to add some of the men still living, Daniel Colladon, the geologist Alphonse Favre, the physicist Raoul Pictet, the geographer P. Chaix, the doctor H. Lombard, *senr.*, the painter L. Lugardon, the poet and novelist Marc Monnier, the Egyptologist Edouard Naville, &c.

5. The works of philanthropy at Geneva attain to a figure out of proportion to the small dimensions of a canton which reckons hardly more than a hundred thousand inhabitants. The latest philanthropic report, in 1879, enumerates no fewer than 268 items, which are classed under the following heads: General philanthropy—General assistance for the needy—Old age, sickness, accidents, hygiene—Instruction—Education and morals—Labour—Domestic Economy—Provident saving. Now, with the exception of certain official establishments, and some eighty-five societies for mutual assistance among the working men, which owe their origin only indirectly to the religion of fraternity, we are in a position to assert that the greater number of these institutions have been founded and are maintained by the Christian thought. Amongst the 268 items one ought to be mentioned which stands third in the list—collecting-boxes for philanthropic and religious works, Genevan, Swiss or foreign, that are put up in various places, and are emptied four times a year by a Christian committee that distributes the amount according to the directions of the donors. The annual result, independently of the collections made from house to house, reaches about fifty thousand francs. To the enumeration of these works we have yet to add about twenty religious societies for evangelisation and edification. It will be impossible not to acknowledge that so many efforts of charity and faith could not have been put forth in the bosom of a population consisting mainly, as some have not feared to assert, of indifferentists or unbelievers.

6. No less suspicion has been cast on the members of the Genevese government. That some magistrates more

or less conservative-liberal, before or after the revolution of 1846 (such as J. J. Rigaud, J. L. Rieu, A. Naville, and at the present time A. Chenevière) should be professed Christians, causes no surprise, though the same thing is not witnessed everywhere; but that there are radical magistrates who treat religion with respect, is a thing that seems to be considered impossible. It is true that the present head of the radical government, Antoine Carteret, is known to declare openly and energetically for liberal protestantism; but what is not known outside of Geneva is that he does honour to his religious profession by a rare probity in public affairs, and by an exemplary domestic life, which his adversaries, political or ecclesiastical, are constrained to recognise. And he is very far from standing alone in these respects in the political circle to which he belongs. Lately, on the 25th of November, the radical Council of State, which had been re-elected, proceeded, according to custom, to deliver its programme at a solemn meeting and in presence of an immense assembly in the Cathedral of St. Peter, and to take, on the Bible, an oath of fidelity to the laws; and M. Gavard, who walks in the steps of M. Carteret, concluded a long speech with the following words, which give the key-note of the party when it is at its best:—

People of Geneva! dear fellow-citizens. The oath that we have taken in your presence, within these ancient walls, the mute but glorious witnesses of the life of a free people, is invested with a solemn character. It is an engagement entered into before God, religiously to observe the constitution and the laws, never, in the administration of public affairs, to depart from the dictates of justice and impartiality, to husband the contributions of the tax-payers, to employ judiciously the resources which are the common property of all, and not to allow any portion of the heritage of the past to be depreciated, but to transmit it intact, only greater and richer if possible, to those who shall come after us. Let every one fulfil his duty with diligence, and the Republic of Geneva will press

forward on its way, with unrelaxing endeavour, to the high destinies to which the practice of whatever is useful and good will conduct it.

May God prosper our common work ! May He protect our country, while continually inspiring her children with the love of labour and the worship of truth !

7. The population of Geneva has been freely accused of not having respected, of late, the great principle of liberty of worship. We shall have a word to say a little further on about the Salvationists ; but first we will lay it down that no service in any of our numerous churches, established or free, Swiss or foreign, has been troubled anywhere by any interference within or any mob disturbance outside. Nor is there any trace whatever of anti-Semitism ; on the contrary the Jews have received on every hand numerous demonstrations of sympathy, which have been called out by the ill-usage their co-religionists have undergone elsewhere. As to the Roman Catholics, it is an exaggeration to give the name of persecution to the legal measures of which they have been the object. It must be borne in mind that the ecclesiastical law of 1873 which commits the nomination of the curés to the Catholic electors, was passed in the Great Council by a majority of 77 to 8, six of the latter being Protestants.

Twenty Catholic deputies were present at the sitting, and of these 17 voted "yea" and 2 "nay," and one abstained from voting. When it was put to the popular vote it was accepted by 9,081 yeas, against 151 noes. It may be said, therefore, that it was passed by the immense majority of the nation. As a consequence of this legislation, the official buildings would be assigned to such of the Catholics as accepted it. The liberal Catholics, however, proposed to the Roman ones that the use of them should be equitably shared ; but the offer was rejected. The Government compelled, in a high-handed way, the opening of the Roman Catholic churches, in certain quarters, to the worship that had been established by the new legislation. This is what the liberal minds at Geneva called "*la manière forte*" in the application of the law, and

it was made a matter of blame and of regret, and with all the more reason in that it injured much more than it benefited liberal Catholicism, which, since the departure of Hyacinthe Loyson, has not prospered. We also are of those who would have preferred what has been called "*la manière douce*," and who desire with all their heart a reconciliation, not indeed of the Ultramontanes with the modern State, for their respective pretensions are incompatible, but of the fellow-citizens belonging to the two confessions. At any rate, we cannot regard men as persecuted who are free to establish wherever they choose halls for worship, or churches, without any opposition or disturbance whatever, while in their journal they treat the Government of the country with extraordinary violence. We cannot admit that they have any right to claim an entire independence of the State, as an unendowed Church, and at the same time enjoy the privileges of union with the State. Not to speak of the past, how many Catholic countries there are to-day in which the Protestants would only be too happy to enjoy the same amount of liberty and peace !

As to the Salvation Army, it is true that its exercises were first disturbed by the populace, and then interdicted by the Government. Personally we regretted this ; but we accounted for it by the aversion of the people for what they call "mummeries"—that is to say, attractions in connection with religion that are eccentric, noisy or enervating, and by the revelation of the Jesuitical character of the regulations of the Salvation Army made by an orthodox Christian, the Countess de Gasparin.

The Salvation Army is served by courageous people, zealous for the conversion of souls ; but it has carried on its operations in such a fashion, that in the three Protestant cantons of French-speaking Switzerland, which is far from having a character for intolerance or irreligion, it has been rejected by public opinion, including that of the majority of Christians. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the inhabitants of Neuchatel who connived at the meetings of the Army were acquitted by the jury of Boudry, and that a

Counsellor of State, the head of the police at Geneva, and, moreover, an upright and energetic man, owed in large measure to the position he took up with regard to the Army, the rebuff he received at the late elections, of November 17.

We think then that it must be allowed by any attentive and impartial observer that liberty of worship is respected at Geneva as much as it is elsewhere, that it is rooted in men's convictions and manners, and that these incidents, greatly as they are to be regretted, are exceptional and temporary, and cannot seriously compromise it.

8. The Genevese people have shown, by their attitude, respect and even sympathy for all the great national associations, religious or moral, which have made Geneva the scene of their general gatherings: the Christian Unions of young people in 1858, the Evangelical Alliance in 1861, the Society for the Observance of the Sabbath, in its first congress of 1876, the British and Continental Federation for the elevation of public morality, under the presidency of the Hon. James Stansfeld, in 1877. The centenary of Calvin in 1864 was less generally celebrated by the people for whom the name of Calvin carried with it certain unsympathetic associations than that of Luther has just been, or than we may hope Zwingli's will be at the beginning of next year.

9. No doubt there are in Geneva, as everywhere at the present day, many persons who are hostile to traditional Christianity, and to the clergy, whom they regard *en bloc* as the supporters of conservatism or of reaction. The city being at the meeting of the ways of Europe, a number of nihilists and social revolutionaries pass through it or stay in it, but the noise they make within its walls is in inverse proportion to that which their names often make outside.

The native populace may be said to know nothing of it,—no rows, no disturbances, no fulminating bombs, no assassinations. We could wish that as much tranquillity were enjoyed by other countries and other cities which display to little purpose the powerful engine of their police and

soldiery. The Genevese have no inclination at all for revolutionary proceedings, advanced as their politics may be; and if the anarchists were to make here the least attempt at a rising, the radical party would be foremost in restoring order. The best proof of these assertions is perhaps in the ill-will expressed towards the people of Geneva by revolutionary and atheistic writers, who have not found the echo there which they had expected.

But we must bring our list of facts to a conclusion.

We cannot accept this ill-founded verdict of the *Spectator*, and knowing, as we do, a great many of the cities both in the Latin and the Germanic countries, we assert, without fear of contradiction by those who take a comprehensive view of the facts, that there are few over whom the religious idea with all that it involves holds still so strong a sway. In fact, it would be contrary to the laws of history, and all the presumptions which we are entitled to draw from the social power of Christianity, if this were not the case. Reality agrees here with logic, and the probability turns out to be the truth.

II.

It is against the Church of Geneva that these attacks have been especially directed. They are made (1) from a dogmatic point of view; and (2) from an ecclesiastical point of view, properly so-called.

1. Our detractors seem to us to judge, in the first instance, according to what we do not hesitate to call a religious and dogmatic prejudice. They start, that is, with the assumption that religion is identical with theology, and, moreover, with a particular theology, the traditional theology known as orthodox.

This prejudice is not shared by the majority of Genevan Christians, even in the free church. They are aware that all the Protestant churches, even those which are the most firmly and strongly governed, are affected in variable degree by what is called heterodoxy, and that it is impossible for

them to protect themselves against it, wherever there is any movement of thought. They know that, judged by such a standard, a good many of the disciples of the Master, whether the seventy or the twelve, would not have been accounted genuine Christians, and that some of the authors of the writings of the New Testament would have been set down as wanting, suspected, or unsound.

They hold that from this point of view the Catholics alone are logical, accepting as they do the *credo* of the Church, in its entirety, without attempting either to revise it, or even to make it their own by that personal faith which is the assent of the whole being to the truth that has been attained to by individual study and experience.

With more or less consistency the great majority of Genevan Christians of to-day insist on the difference between belief and faith, theology and religion; between a creed (however orthodox) and vital Christianity; a view which does not prevent them from differing from one another in their theology and their creed.

A rapid glance at the history of religious ideas in Geneva during the nineteenth century seems required for a right understanding of the actual state of parties in the church.

At the beginning of the century there prevailed in the National Church a way of thinking which has sometimes been called, not without a feeling of hostility, Genevianism. It was characterised by a sincere supernaturalism, which made valiant war on the rationalism of Voltaire, and even on that of Rousseau, while at the same time it was heterodox on certain capital points of tradition—the Trinity, the atonement by the blood of Christ, everlasting punishment. These were not directly attacked; but in the absence of sufficient evidence for them in the Scriptures they were set on one side. This, however, did not prevent the men who held this position from courageously maintaining the cause of Christianity in the midst of the unchaining of the irreligious passions of the Revolution.

Presently came the Revival, which had been in preparation for several years, but which came to an issue in

1817, in Geneva first among the countries where the French tongue is spoken. There were some general causes which had prepared the way for it here as elsewhere; the reaction against the 18th century, the passionate return to the great memories of the past, a just admiration for St. Paul possessing men's minds again, religious needs long repressed, a hunger and thirst of the mind for the ideal. Some special factors determined it; the activity of a little group of Moravians, the influence of Haldane, and that of some other Englishmen who were the organs of a Methodist propaganda, and the influence, less conspicuous but more widely felt, of certain national pastors who had remained evangelical. The young men who identified themselves with the movement had talent, zeal, and piety; and several of them rose to eminence, such as César Malan, Ami Bost, Louis Gaussen, Merle d'Aubigné. Taken altogether, the Revival showed its power in evangelisation, in the organisation of independent churches, and in a number of religious works.

But, as it seems to us, it had the great defect that it shut itself up in the antiquated theology of the 16th and 17th centuries, and affirmed before all things the plenary inspiration of Scripture, and all the dogmas which the Reformation, adhering too faithfully to many articles of tradition, held to be contained in Scripture—the Trinity, the personality of the Holy Spirit, Predestination, particular Election, the absolute authority of the constitution of the Apostolic Church, &c., &c. And it committed the further error of fixing these in new confessions of faith, in which there was little to be perceived of the spirit and methods of the 19th century, or I might even say of the vital breath of the Revival itself.

The ancient Genevan school, which still had the control of the National Church, struggled against this invasion of traditional dogmatism, in the review called *Le Protestant* (1831-1838), and it obtained its triumph in the third jubilee of the Reformation, in 1835. Its watchword was "The Bible and Free Enquiry," and its symbol the medal of the Jubilee, bearing the device of a Bible on the altar, with

the two figures, Reason and Faith, and the motto *Biblia Fidei et Rationi restituta*.

This first period of conflict between the two tendencies presently gave way to a truce of some length, which lasted till 1869, and during which what is generally known as Evangelicism prevailed. A conception of Christianity that was deeper and more inward than that of the eighteenth century, representing it, above all things, as a teaching and a practical life, had been sown in ground that was well prepared to receive it. The influence of the pupils of Neander and of Vinet, and that, earlier in date, of the Genevan thinkers and preachers, such as the pastors Cellérier père, Barthélemy Bouvier, Charles Chenevière, J. J. Martin, and Professors Diodati and Cellérier fils, had slowly but surely established the conviction that Christianity is much less a doctrine than a life, the life of communion with God, lived by the Master, and communicated to his disciples by virtue of his sacrifice, and the gift of his spirit.

With these convictions there came to be connected a new zeal for the development of the Christian life and for the maintenance of Christian influences in the midst of our changeful and progressive society, in which pure democracy had established itself by the two successive revolutions of 1841 and 1846. This zeal carried with it all the clergy, and such of the laity as had taken to heart the lessons and the needs of the time. The Protestants, moreover, had a strong motive for agreement amongst themselves in the invasion of Catholicism through the immigration of foreigners, the increasingly seductive attractions of Ultramontaniam, which were energetically though differently represented by the curé Vuarin and by his successor, the wily and brilliant orator Mermillod. Accordingly, every effort of the theologians and the preachers was devoted, on the one hand, to a learned or popular polemic against Catholicism, on the other to a popular system of apologetics. A great number of addresses, of lectures and discourses, from the pulpit or the platform, in the churches or in the *Salle de la Réformation*, were given with one or other of these purposes in view,

by several distinguished men, such as the controversialist Bungener, the apologists Agénor de Gasparin, Ernest Naville, and others, French or Swiss ; MM. de Pressensé, Bersier, Bois, de Rougemont, Puaux, Charles Secrétan, F. Godet, &c.

The general and indisputable result of this great literary and practical activity was threefold. It maintained and propagated the Protestant spirit in the new social strata ; it brought clearly before men's minds, what a long and vital experience had for centuries been leading the Genevese republicans to recognise, the necessity and the excellence of religion in both private and public life. In short the two Churches, the national and the free, the two tendencies which had hitherto been in rivalry with one another, were drawn together by the force of these common dangers and united efforts.

In 1869 a new champion was to come down into the arena, and to provoke fresh conflicts. It was what is known as the new liberalism, or liberal Christianity, or modern theology. It made its first appearance in the teaching of the professor of oratory, Edmund Scherer (afterwards the senator and the celebrated critic), on occasion of his resignation in 1849, followed by the publication of the *Revue de Strasbourg* by his friend Colani. But this incident had no immediate effect in Geneva, except in the meditations of certain young minds. Liberal Christianity reappeared in French-speaking Switzerland in 1869, on occasion of a controversy about the use to be made of the Bible in the education of the young. The question of the value of the doctrine of plenary inspiration was thus openly and conspicuously brought forward, and from that time a schism was inevitable between those who were alarmed by the modern theology and those who had, for a longer or shorter time, been silently drawn towards it. This schism openly proclaimed itself towards the end of 1869, on the one hand by the establishment of the journal, the *Alliance Libérale*, as the organ of the new ideas ; on the other hand by the more bellicose character henceforth assumed by the *Semaine Religieuse*, which has been, since 1853, the organ of the practical activity of

Evangelicism. The two schools of thought were not slow in organising themselves, and connecting themselves with kindred associations established in Switzerland, and in ranging their adherents, ecclesiastical and lay, in two opposition societies, the *Union Nationale Évangélique*, and the *Union du Christianisme Libéral*. We may just give a general outline of the doctrines of these two societies respectively.

Those of the evangelicals have been embodied by them in the "declaration of principles" which was signed in January, 1870, by fifty-three out of the ninety-three clergymen belonging, at that time, to Geneva; and it was addressed to the public. The substance of the document is contained in the following articles:—

We believe it to be our duty to make the following declaration in opposition to those which characterise the liberal doctrine, so-called.

For us Christianity is not simply a product of the progress of human reason and conscience. It is, in the full meaning of the words, a supernatural fact, a revelation of God and of His redeeming love.

For us, the Bible is, therefore, not simply a human book, superior to other human books. It is the Word of God, inspired by His Spirit, and we continue to recognise in it the sole authority in matters of faith.

For us Jesus Christ is not merely the ideal man, the perfect man. He is the only Son of God, the Word made flesh, and we affirm, with His divine nature, His supernatural birth, and His glorious resurrection.

For us, therefore, neither is Jesus Christ merely an initiator of the religious life and the moral life; He is, in the full sense of the word, the Saviour, who has ransomed us by His death from the condemnation of sin, and by whom alone henceforth we can find grace with God.

For us, finally, the Christian life is not and cannot be the result of the natural dispositions and the forces proper to man. It is the fruit of our union with Christ, and has its necessary origin in a new spiritual birth, which is the work of God in us by the Holy Spirit.

Such is our faith: founded on the authority of the Word of

God ; it is neither more nor less than the full adhesion of our reason, our conscience and our heart to the truth.*

Now this declaration is already nearly fourteen years old, and in the present age the evolution of ideas does not go on slowly. We have reason to believe that many who signed this document which was struck off in the heat of the conflict, would not put it in the same shape to-day, and would express their convictions in a form less directly opposed to modern theology. Let us await a new opportunity.

Turning now to Liberal Christianity ; we do not find any collective counter-declaration of its adherents, for two reasons. In the first place, this phase of opinion has presented itself, by the simple force of circumstances, under a negative aspect, and in the next place, the avowed partisans of individual liberty in matters of faith, shrink from anything that would appear to bind them to the letter of a document, in a common bond. At the same time liberal Protestantism finds ample enough expression in the journals, the addresses and the publications of its principal adherents in the French-speaking countries.†

The following, briefly and in broad outline, is their theology. As they have come forward in the character of reformers we may properly mention first what it is they reject, and then what they retain, of the great traditions of the Churches.

What they reject is authority under the diverse forms in which it has continued to be recognised in Protestantism, plenary inspiration, miracles, the supernatural, dogmatism and confessionalism, that is to say the claim to confine the spirit of Christianity within superannuated formulas and

* These ideas have found expression in the works of F. Coulin, the most distinguished orator of the party, L. Choisy, F. Chaponnière, the learned and clever editor of the *Semaine*; and in the *Etrennes Religieuses*, a collection of articles of edification, history, varieties, and news, with an ecclesiastical chronicle of the year, which has appeared since 1850.

† In France the late Athanase Coquerel fils, Colani, Pécaut, Réville and others who have remained within the circle of ecclesiastical activity, such as Fontanés, Vigué, H. Mouchon, Gérold, Théophile and Elisée Bost, C. and E. Rabaud ; and, at Geneva, amongst others J. Cougnard, the late J. Viollier, Chantre, &c.

to impose them on believers as the adequate expression of divine truth itself,—“a stone in place of bread.”

What they retain is, in the first place, Christian theism, while at the same time they do not take sufficient account of the great problem which is involved in the term, I mean the relation between the immanence and the transcendence of God. In the French-speaking countries, especially at Geneva, I do not know a single theologian who in his boldest flights—which are discreet by the side of those of not a few German theologians—has ever called theism in question. Not one is an Agnostic or a Positivist. It can only have been in ignorance that the contrary has been asserted. The next point of doctrine is the central and supreme place which belongs to Christ in the faith and religious life of the soul and in the history of humanity,—Christ the revealer of the sonship of man and the fatherhood of God, the founder of the kingdom of God, or of true moral and social civilisation. Finally there is the belief in the personal survival of the soul, which, in the view of almost all, will issue, under the government of the God of love, in universal salvation.

We might charge the liberals, like the rest of the Genevese, with a certain lack of mysticism. The Genevese is a good naturalist and historian; he observes facts; but in philosophy he has done little more than generalise experience, and, as a rule, he is wanting in speculative boldness and in depth.

We owe but few writings (beyond the articles in the *Alliance*) to the liberal party in Geneva.*

Beyond these parties, or in an intermediate position between them, we find a group of men who are non-militant, and who have preferred for the most part not to rank themselves exclusively with either party, but to remain in-

* We should mention however *La Résurrection de Jesus Christ*, by S. Viollier, a remarkable attempt to explain the development of this belief in the apostolic age; the occasional sermons of the eloquent Professor Cougnard, the studies and moral conferences of Pastor Guillermet, and a series of annual volumes, which correspond to those of the *Evangelicals*, and which have appeared since 1874 under the name of *Etrennes Chrétiennes*.

dependent. They constitute, as it were, the right centre and the left centre. They are by choice professed theologians, professors of the national faculty, and certain young pastors who have been alive to the dangers of the spirit of party. These men have attempted to combine free science and faith, and have laboured for the reconciliation of men's minds in this field of thought.

It was in their spirit that there was founded twelve years ago the *Société des Sciences Théologiques*, in which are presented and debated with perfect courtesy, from different points of view, every month, papers on questions of doctrine or religious history. The majority of the theological works of importance which have appeared of late years have emanated from this group.*

We believe that while they may be left somewhat in the background during the excitement of the conflict, this group will exercise a continually increasing influence, and will succeed much better than the liberals with their sharp polemic, in detaching the younger generation from the traditional dogmatism, so as to lead them to that higher synthesis of modern science and piety towards which all earnest minds are aspiring.

2. I have said that the detractors of the national church of Geneva start with a second prejudice—the ecclesiastical prejudice—namely, that the true church must be a close corporation, in which the clergy and laity are bound by an orthodox confession of faith. There are two means by

* The new version of the Old Testament, by Professor Segond, of the New, by Professor Oltramare; the *Commentary* (in two volumes) on the *Epistle to the Romans*, by the latter; the great *History of Christianity* (in five volumes), by the ex-Professor Chastel, lately completed; *Le Dogmatisme et les Grands Traits de la Religion de l'Humanité*, by César Malan fils; *La Fin du Mal*, by Petavel Olliff; *L'Introduction à l'étude de la Théologie protestante*, by Ernest Martin; *La Genèse de l'Idée de Dieu*, by J. J. Gourd; to which may be added the works of the present writer, the two latest of which have been noticed in the *Modern Review*. The same spirit seems to us to have inspired most of the theses which the candidates in theology maintain, and publish at the conclusion of their studies in the national faculty, (those of the *Ecole Libre* do not publish theirs), to obtain their degree or their licence. There have been a hundred and ten since 1872.

which this result can be secured. We may either have a congregational church composed of voluntary adherents grouped round a creed of their own choosing ; or we may have a national church with a clergy that subscribes to some ancient historic confession, and looks after the faith of the flock. The only position we can see besides these two is this third one, of a church in which pastors, teachers, and laity, in perfect freedom, remain united in spirit with Jesus Christ, and united to one another in the bond of memories and examples, and of a real inner mission to society. It is this last attitude that the Genevan church has come, in course of time, to take up, and which I allow is perhaps difficult of comprehension outside the country itself, on which account it is generally misunderstood and severely and unjustly judged.

Circumstances have led this church to separate itself more and more from confessionalism and clericalism, and to advance in a more liberal direction. We may show how this has come to pass by taking a rapid glance at the course of events.

During the second half of the sixteenth century and the whole of the seventeenth, Calvinistic orthodoxy had prevailed, not without hardness. It asserted itself against the infiltrations of Arminianism and Cartesianism in turn, by the canons of Dordrecht and the *Consensus*. Men's minds, however straitly repressed and unintelligently divided, did not submit to this yoke without impatience ; and, at the beginning of the 18th century, under the influence of a great mind, Alphonse Turretini, a friend of Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, the Church of Geneva set itself on two separate occasions (1706 and 1725) to shake it off, in order to substitute the Bible for every confession of ecclesiastical faith. It went so far as to recognise no other rule of faith than the Bible interpreted by private inquiry. This régime continued for a hundred and fifty years, and became a tradition of liberty which was a source of legitimate pride. In the *Règlement organique de l'Eglise*, which was drawn up by the evangelicals, after the democratic constitution of 1847,

the following articles appeared under the first heading, 'The Church.'

1. The National Protestant Church of Geneva receives as the Word of God, and asdivinely inspired, the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. It takes them as the basis and the sole rule of faith and life, infallible and entirely sufficient.

2. Founded on this basis, it recognises for each one of its members the right of free inquiry.

3. This Church, instituted for the advancement of the kingdom of God by faith in Jesus Christ, has as its special mission to provide for the religious and moral interests of the members who compose it.

4. It admits, as the sole rule of its teaching, the teaching of God as it is contained in the revealed books.

5. It is united in a spiritual communion, by the bond of Christian brotherhood, with the evangelical churches which are founded on the authority of the Word of God.

After the appearance of the new liberalism, the logic of the situation removed out of the way even this remnant, certainly modest enough, of a confession of faith. The expression "infallible rule" had, since the Vatican Council, on the one hand, and the controversy about plenary inspiration, on the other, acquired a rigorous meaning which in the first instance had not belonged to it; and so the liberals could not keep it without inconsistency. The first section therefore disappeared. Under stress of the same experiences the obligatory character of the old official catechism disappeared also (the obligation, by the way, was practically very elastic), as well as that of the liturgies. It is to be observed that the liturgies of the Reformation had from time to time undergone various modifications both in substance and in style, each edition marking a further remove from Calvinism. The last revision, however, of 1861, had still an impress which was somewhat strongly evangelical. The liberals proposed, as an addition to the prayers and the formulary of 1861, some new formularies, cast in the same mould but of a different theological texture, and the liberal consistory of 1875 printed a final edition, containing, side by side, the two

series, which differed from one another less than might have been expected. The liberals, however, have ceased to read from the pulpit the "Apostles' Creed," on account of their having been reproached with not accepting, *ex animo*, all its articles.

This absence, however, of a confession of faith or prescribed liturgy, by no means prevents the two groups from making, each on its own account, when the occasion arises, such declaration of principles as may be deemed necessary for the edification of the people, or for making their convictions clear. I have already mentioned that of the evangelicals in 1870. There have been articles written with the same object in the *Alliance*. We go so far as to believe that the whole Church might be brought, in such a concurrence of circumstances, to set forth its aim, its mission, the God whose love it proclaims, the spiritual head on which it depends, and the engagement to the spiritual life which is more or less expressly entered into by all those who have a part in that life. But such a declaration would have no resemblance to the old confessions of faith. With these the Church of Geneva will no longer have anything to do, because the difficulties and dangers connected with them have been too vividly experienced. Moreover the majority of the members of the Church feel no need of them. The Church is a moral personality which has already had a long experience of life; she has a strongly marked physiognomy, in spite of the changes in her formulas; and as regards her Protestant type, her vital character and position in the land, she has remained always the same. No son will ask of his mother: Who art thou? No Genevan Protestant can fail to recognise the living unity, which, by her training, she has impressed on all her children. Neither of the two theological parties ventures to claim her exclusively for its own doctrine. This is so true that the evangelicals and the liberals, after having quarrelled among one another pretty sharply for seven or eight years, have in the end perceived that the two tendencies corresponded to two needs which were different from one another, but equally waiting to be satisfied;

that they had neither the power nor the right to dispossess one another; that the two groups had an equal claim to the heritage of the fathers, to a place of their own in the house; and that at the elections, while each did its best to obtain a majority, they were bound for the sake of justice as well as of peace to leave a share to the opposition.

The Church of Geneva has advanced more slowly, but not less surely, in a direction contrary to clericalism. The Company of Pastors, which till lately had a preponderating influence in ecclesiastical and academical affairs, had retained this in great measure since the Restoration under the régime of the Constitution of 1814. Some attempts were made on its privileges in 1834 and 1842, but it received its severest blow in the democratic revolution of 1846 and the Constitution which followed in 1847. It was then that, with the applause of several distinguished evangelicals, for the *Church of the Clergy* was substituted the *Church of the People*. From that time onwards, the universal suffrage of Protestant citizens has decided everything. It is they who elect the Consistory, it is they who appoint the Pastors in every parish. The Consistory administers and directs the Church. This body, composed of twenty-five laymen and six pastors, has two laymen as president and secretary; which does not prevent the small minority of ecclesiastics from exercising a just influence in its counsels. The Company of Pastors has finally lost the small remnant of power which was reserved to it by the law concerning Public Instruction of 1872, and the constitutional ecclesiastical law of 1874. The university regulations including the Faculty of Theology as well as the four others, the Company was deprived of the power of nominating the professors and superintending the theological studies, and the right of requiring the examinations of the candidates to be submitted to them. The theological students, nevertheless, are dependent on them in so far as they perform, under the title of *Proposants*, the offices of worship. Besides this the pastors are always summoned to sit on the boards of examiners.

To sum up: the result of the whole movement has been

to destroy clericalism, in principle at least, and to give the laity a preponderating share in the direction of religious affairs; from which, however, it by no means follows that pastors distinguished by their capacities and their zeal have lost their personal influence.

Such a state of things may seem alarming enough to those who theorise about the question of the Church. To those people whose lives do not belong to it and who do not interpret it by its history, its circumstances, and usages it may appear suspicious, dangerous, and deprived of all safeguards. But these fears have but little foundation. There remain, in fact, sufficiently solid guarantees in the education both of the future pastors and of the Protestant citizens.

As regards the former, there is hardly a chance that the parishes would elect any but Genevese, or students of the Faculty who, as *Proposants*, have been for three years under the moral superintendence of the Company of Pastors, and who, moreover, have become known to the public by their preaching and by the share they may have taken in religious works.

And as to the Protestant citizens, we may judge of their fitness to take part in the affairs of the church if we take into account the influences of the following institutions:—the pastor's annual house-to-house visitation of his parish; the religious consecration of marriages; the funeral services, conducted in the bosom of the family; the lessons in religion given in the state schools, which are optional but are generally attended; and the association of pastors with laymen in a number of patriotic and philanthropic works. Special account is to be taken of the deep influence of a characteristic institution, the religious instruction of the catechumens, which is conducted as follows:—All the young people in the Protestant families are invited to attend a course of instruction given by the pastor of the parish, or by some other pastor selected by themselves,—the course extending over eight months in the town, or two winters in the country. They are not admitted till they

are of an age to profit most by this education, the boys at 16 years, the girls at 15. The course is concluded by an examination, followed by a solemn public ceremony, in which the young people voluntarily enter into a serious engagement by replying "yes" to the questions which we here transcribe.

1. You, then, catechumens, who present yourselves for admission to the Lord's Supper, have you a sincere faith in the truths of the Gospel, and are you so persuaded of these truths that you are ready to suffer anything rather than abandon the profession of them?

2. Will you, in response to the love which God has shown in Jesus Christ, love the Lord your God with all your heart and all your soul and all your mind?

3. Will you love your neighbour as yourself, and live with all your brethren in peace, in charity, and in the communion of Jesus?

4. Are you resolved, trusting in the help of the Holy Spirit, to fight against sin, and to regulate all your life by the commandments of God?

5. In order continually to strengthen your faith and your piety, do you promise to give yourselves to prayer, to read carefully the Word of God, and diligently to frequent the services of public worship?

6. You declare, then, in the presence of God and of the Church, that you confirm the vow of your baptism, and that you consecrate yourself to God your Father and to Jesus Christ your Saviour. Is this, catechumens, what you declare?

In consequence of these declarations and these promises, I admit you, in the name of the Lord, to partake of the Holy Supper, and to all the privileges of the new Covenant which God has made with us by His Son.

Such is the force of a tradition of centuries, the benefits of which successive generations have so well appreciated, that scarcely a single Genevan family holds itself aloof. I do not hesitate to say that, notwithstanding the lamentable number of men and women who forget the pledges of their early days, there remains an indelible recollection of this period of their life—memories which revive

in the trials of mature years, like the more ancient writing in certain palimpsests. I do not hesitate to attribute to it a good part of that religious character which persists in the Swiss conscience, and at Geneva more especially, that interest in the things of religion, that regard and affection for the pastor, of which so many evidences abound; and I see in it all a guarantee, a purely moral one, it is true, and therefore variable and liable to be weakened, as are those of education, but still a genuine one. The Church, then, is a mutual school, an institution of the higher civilisation; and the journals and radical orators, in 1880, declared it to be necessary, useful, beneficial, for the morality, the culture, the happiness of the nation, more especially by virtue of its breadth and its hold upon the people.

For the rest, there could not be any other guarantee of the sincerity of men in the conduct of their spiritual affairs; and why do we distrust these so often? Why should they seem to count for nothing in comparison with the legal guarantees, and the control of the authorities? Is it that we have at bottom a want of that confidence which Jesus had in human nature, which is the offspring of God? Is it not to ignore the hold which honour, good sense, and enlightened interest have on the mind of the individual and of the masses? What! is it imagined, and has any one the assurance to say that young people without any vocation, without faith, as freethinkers hardly believing in a God at all, would enter on a course of theological study, long, laborious, difficult, and then on such a career as that of the Christian ministry, which is less lucrative and more beaten upon by the winds than any other, and in which God, conscience, and the opinion of men compel the minister of the Gospel to treat his commission seriously, and to be faithful to it? What a gratuitous outrage on a clergy entitled to all respect! What an insult, even to common sense! Is it to be believed that these much-despised liberals would crave a ministry which must be peculiarly difficult for them, and abounding in bitter fruits, without any strong and clear conviction that they are the

messengers of true Christianity? And is it to be imagined that the Protestant people, with the general education which we have depicted, and with a long experience of public life, and of the exercise of electoral rights, and an undeniable interest in the welfare of institutions which have so many claims on their regard, are going with a light heart and a frivolous mind to appoint as directors of their church unworthy men, enemies of Christianity! And does any one, in his ignorance of men and affairs, dare to assert that these things are done! This, too, is a pure calumny.

The *Semaine Religieuse* has called attention to the fact that of the eleven pastors last elected by the people, seven were évangélical, four liberal. A late election which took place on the 28th of October, brought to the city an evangelical pastor from the country, M. Doret, a man held in the highest esteem by everyone. We are in a position to declare that, after taking into full account the respective weight of the parties who have in turn gained the day, the Consistories appointed by universal suffrage have all taken their duties seriously to heart, and have fulfilled them with justice and fidelity. And as to their sincere attachment to the Gospel, it is easy to judge of it from their *Addresses* to the congregations. Your readers may judge it for themselves from the following extract from the Charge which the present Consistory, with a liberal majority, published last September, signed by its lay president.

A people without religious principles, a people who would be the slaves of their interests and their passions, greedy of pleasure and accessible to the voice of flattery, would not be slow in sinking. Such a people would no longer produce those strong moral personalities who have done honour to our country. Shall we, dear fellow-citizens, renounce a past to which we owe so much? Shall we renounce the idea of being in the future a Christian and believing people, and content ourselves with the bread that perisheth? Shall we limit the range of our hopes to the narrow horizon of the present time, and break with the traditions of piety and sanctity? The Consistory are persuaded that you have no such thoughts. They urge you therefore to

celebrate the fasts of humiliation to which you are summoned, with a feeling of sincere repentance, individual and national. Bring to these religious festivals a spirit of prayer and supplication, and let everyone who has at heart the maintenance of our national Church assure himself that this venerable institution depends less on the popular vote than on the worth of its members.

The new Consistory which you have called to take in hand for four years the administration of the Church, convinced that a disputatious and narrow spirit is injurious to the cause of religion, invites you all to give it the support of your co-operation and your enlightenment. Let us profit by the truce in the discussion of ecclesiastical questions which seems to prevail in the land, and learn to love and respect one another. Let us build up one another in the faith of God our Father, and of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Let us forget those things which are behind us and press forward towards the things that are before, desiring but one thing: that the Kingdom of God may come, and that His will may be done in our happy corner of the earth as it is done in heaven.

There is one more feature which characterises the Church of Geneva, namely its *Nationalism*. This is inherent in it by virtue of its origin and its history. We have recalled how, up to the time of its annexation by France, the old republic was exclusively Protestant, how all its citizens took the oath of allegiance to the gospel, and how the Church was connected in the closest union with the State, and the State with the Church. Since the rule of the French, which introduced Catholicism into Geneva, and the treaties of 1815 which incorporated in the old republic, when it was restored and became Swiss again, certain French and Sardinian Catholic communities, Catholicism has been recognised as having equal rights, and its priests have been paid by the State. But, in point of fact, Geneva has remained a Protestant country, in education, in character, in its passion for liberty, its aversion for the domination of the priest in the intellectual and moral realm. This is just what determined its resistance to the pretensions of the Vatican, armed with its syllabus and its infallibility; that brought about the

expulsion of the Curé Mermillod, when he posed as apostolic vicar, in spite of the State and the confederation, and soon after the foundation of a national Catholic church, of which, however, I do not intend to speak here. Suffice it to affirm this profoundly national character of the Protestant church, connected as it is by such ancient and close bonds with the destinies of our people.

The idea, however, of the separation of the Church from the State, which is quite justifiable in theory, was introduced among the Protestants of Geneva in the first instance by the appearance of small independent churches which were created by the Revival, and which, by the high qualities of some of their leaders, and by their activity, have received a notable increase in numbers; and it gained ground by the propaganda of the disciples of Vinet, and also of some free-thinkers, and more recently still by the local adhesion of the Ultramontanes. The question has on several occasions been brought before the political councils of the country, in 1842, 1847, 1855, and last of all in 1879 and 1880. It is well known that it was decided by a very large majority in favour of the maintenance of the union, on the 4th of July, 1880, as has been related in the *Contemporary Review* (August, 1882). All the liberals, both pastors and laymen, voted for the union. Certain evangelical pastors who, after the passing of the new law of 1874, had signed an Address, declaring that they remained in the national Establishment to labour there to raise up the true Church in the country, pronounced for separation in their discourses and by their votes. It seemed as if logic must compel them to leave the church; but they have remained in it. The separatists have reproached them for this. We cannot do so. There are in life forces which are mightier and even more legitimate than that of logic. They have remained from attachment to the parishes which they had so long served, and which, in return, had multiplied upon them the proofs of their gratitude. Need we add also that after the first heat of the struggle between evangelicism and liberalism, the evangelicals ended in recognising the

rights of the liberals, not only within the pale of the outward institution, where it is evident, but, what they had contested and what is more important, within the spiritual pale of Christianity itself; and that at the last moment they recoiled, in 1880, as they had done after the Constitution of 1874, from a schism which would have separated them from old friends, and would have compromised the position of Protestantism in the country and the influence of Christianity on the masses. We begin to understand that these two conceptions of Christianity are not incompatible, and that some day the work of theology will bring them to that higher synthesis of which we have previously spoken; and meanwhile the two parties must bear with one another in the same establishment, and make mutual concessions in all things which are not expressly matters of conscience.

This is in fact the position of affairs to-day. Each of the two parties has included in its list some names from the other side. The Consistory elected in 1879, with a majority of evangelicals, went by the name of the "Consistory of pacification," and the system of a limited vote, which guaranteed the representation of the minority, was very nearly carried, in May, 1883, on the advice of an eminent historian of the country, the type of the true citizen, a friend of justice and of peace, who died shortly after, and whose name must be placed on this page—Amédée Roget. The Protestant electoral body, taking it altogether, is animated by a genuine spirit of equity; and if we consider the whole series of nominations which it has made we see that it has instinctively kept the balance true. It is a practical reply, and the best that could be made to the detractors of the present régime, to those who, closing their eyes and ears, cry Anarchy! Disorder! Triumph of Unbelief! Anti-Christian Church!

The National Church has thus come to be inspired with a spirit of intelligent tolerance, and to assist the free play, within its bosom, of different groups, and the activity of little churches within the great one, on the condition, always, that its directing and controlling body shall keep a firm hand in the administration of the whole, and not allow

itself to be deprived of this power by any one of the militant parties, since in it alone resides the power to maintain order by just and equal dealing. Your Anglican church includes three parties which differ from one another as ours do—High-church, Broad-church and Low-church; and yet it lives,—so surely will life baffle and surpass logic.

Let us take a last general survey of the facts which we have successively set forth, and then let us seek to gain from them some prevision of the future.

1. The Church of Geneva is divided into two parties (for it is absurd to say that there are "as many opinions as parishes") and the collision between them is greatly lessened by the independent minds who do not range themselves exclusively on this side or that. The liberals carry the day in the city, where they have for the most part the support of the resident Swiss of other cantons. In the country the case is reversed.

2. We cannot prevent the working of the respective affinities of the religious parties and the political parties. The liberals have generally the support of the radicals, the evangelicals that of the conservatives. As far as that goes, are not these relations in the nature of things, and met with everywhere? Are not your liberals rather dissenters, and your conservatives rather partisans of the High church? And in Germany is not the governmental party rather orthodox, Lutheran, and the liberals friends of the party called national and progressist? The main thing is not to allow to the divergent affinities a mischievous power over men's belief and conscience.

3. The Church, under the democratic régime, has seen the laity take a continually greater part in its interests and its works, not only because it has afforded them more rights, but also because it has called them to more duties. The régime, indeed, requires of all greater watchfulness for the maintenance and triumph of their convictions. The more manifest it makes the evils that exist, the more does it call out the efforts for good; and we believe that, in this way far from stifling religion or causing it to be eclipsed in men's minds by more conspicuous and more

urgent political and social interests, it stimulates all the religious and moral energies and impels them in a course which is stormy, indeed, but attractive to all holy ambitions.

And now if we turn from the present state of things to the prospects which it opens out to us, the following are some of the glimpses we get as regards doctrine.

Religion is a power, at once ethical and mystical, which is inherent in the human mind, urging the will and the affections towards the infinite, and nowhere better comprehended, aided and satisfied than in Christianity, regarded as the reflection and the work of Him who could call God the Father, and himself the Son, and us, with him, the Sons of God. But this power, great as it is, is not always, even amongst Christians, as enlightened as it should be. Being connected with a particular fact, the figure of Christ, who is himself at the centre of a vast history, it requires the help of science to control the knowledge of the fact, of reason to formulate the impression which this fact leaves on men's souls, and to define and co-ordinate the ideas which the fact carries with it, to correct those which have prevailed in different periods, in a word, to reconcile vital faith, or Christian experience, with reason. We venture to assert it is to this end that the efforts of the Genevan clergy have been directed since the beginning of the last century. That the historical and literary criticism of the Bible, which is almost entirely a product of the present century, was wanting in the 18th was almost inevitable; and we may admit, without surprise, that in the course of the 19th century there has not been a sufficient measure of that genius at once speculative and mystical, that blending of fidelity to Christ with boldness and penetration in the knowledge of the world, without which we shall never see a complete reconciliation of faith and modern thought.

But let us give the liberals full credit for the way in which, with all their disadvantages, they have tended in this direction, and let us encourage the evangelicals, with all the solid wealth of their traditional equipment,

to undertake this noble research. Some recent indications have led us to hope that the Genevan clergy, as a whole, feel impelled to advance along this fruitful path.

Finally let us consider the future of the Question of the Church. All the forms which Reformed Protestantism can give to the Church have been tried at Geneva. The Revival asserted the divine authority of the organisation of the Apostolic church, and would have it reproduced in our day. The various experiments which have been tried and tried again by the free church have shown that in the matter of the Church there is nothing absolutely and eternally true ; that the Church has a relative existence and, in the spirit of the Founder of the kingdom of God, must modify itself according to the times and circumstances, and the religious and other needs of the age and the country. In the national church the same result has been attained, by different experiences. Here also the effect of the union of the Church and State and of universal suffrage in ecclesiastical affairs, has shown that this method of church government is not the only one which makes for the extension and confirmation of the kingdom of God in modern society. Experience has clearly shown us that while the kingdom of God is the end, the Church is but the means ; and that the means may and should vary, while the end remains the same, that is, the education of the individual and of society in and by the spirit of Christ. If this higher liberty in regard to the question of the Church and its different aspects, together with this firm adherence to the unchanging aim, is being continually more fully apprehended in this little workshop of ecclesiastical novelties which is called Geneva, the lesson may be taken to heart in larger countries and by the whole of the Protestant world. The essential thing is not such and such a relation between Church and State, such and such a position of clergy and laity respectively ; the essential thing is that enlightened Christians should make it their aim to become more and more truly, in their country and within their own circle, the light and the salt of the world.

AUGUSTE BOUVIER.

OUTLINES AND EPISODES OF BRAHMIC HISTORY.

THE name of the Brahmo Somaj, or Theistic Church of India, has of late been recalled to public attention in Europe by several occurrences. The fiftieth anniversary of the death of its founder, Rájá Rám Mohun Roy, was recently commemorated in the city where that event took place, by an interesting lecture from Professor Max Müller: an eloquent Brahmo missionary has been making a preaching tour through England and the United States; and various able writers, English, French, and Dutch, have been publishing biographical or historical sketches of the Brahmo Somaj, either separately or in current periodicals. But the fullest epitome of the movement which has yet appeared from an European hand is contained in a work just published by Count Goblet d'Alviella, on Contemporary Religious Evolution. * In the first two sections of the book the author sketches the various phases of what he terms "Religious Rationalism" in England and the United States, while the third section is devoted to Indian Theism. The author, who had previously published a little book of travels in India—*Inde et Himalaya*—makes no claim to acquaintance with the Indian languages, but he has diligently studied such native publications as are accessible in English, besides many English compilations from original sources, and he has woven all this various information into a continuous narrative which is both lucid and

L'Évolution Religieuse Contemporaine chez les Anglais, les Américains, et les Hindous. Par LE COMTE GOBLET D'ALVIELLA, Membre de la Chambre des Représentants de Belgique. Paris: Baillière. Brussels: C. Muquardt. London: Nutt, 270, Strand. 1884.

graphic, and should go far to render the story familiar to European readers. A few errors of detail may be observed here and there, and some of the judgments expressed by the author are open to considerable question; but taken as a whole, his sketch may be undoubtedly recommended as the best summary of Brahmic history accessible to non-Oriental readers, and as marked throughout by an earnest desire to present a faithful picture of the reality.

To those who have watched the Brahmo Somaj with sympathetic interest for many years, it is deeply gratifying to observe all these tokens of its gradual entrance into the religious commonwealth of mankind, as a recognised power for moral and religious good. At the same time, it is impossible not to be struck by one limitation which is common to all the European summaries of Brahmic history that have yet appeared, viz.: that with the exception of a few rare passages here and there, they are all confined to the proceedings of a few remarkable men in the city of Calcutta. Count Goblet d'Alviella's book is partly an exception to this; he is really aware that Calcutta and India are not synonymous terms, and he gives a few occasional glimpses of the background to his picture; but it does not enter into his plan to do more. Yet it is quite time that more should be done, and that Western thinkers who care to understand what the Brahmo movement really is, should study it in those phases which have hitherto passed unnoticed here. Fully to do justice to these less familiar aspects of the subject would require more space than a review article, and linguistic qualifications which the present writer does not possess; but some contributions to such a sketch may be here given. Passing lightly, therefore, over those portions of the chief Calcutta events which are tolerably well known, and to which the pages of the *Évolution Religieuse* render such full justice, the following narrative will supply, where practicable, some of the missing links, and attempt to give a general view of the whole.

It is now just fifty-four years since the January day on which the Brahmo Somaj was first definitely established in

Calcutta, in the presence of five hundred Indians, and one solitary Englishman, Mr. Montgomery Martin, who had, under the instructions of Rám Mohun Roy, drawn up the well-known Trust Deed by which the building was set apart "for a place of Public Meeting of all sorts and descriptions of people, as shall behave and conduct themselves in an orderly, sober, religious and devout manner, for the worship and adoration of the Eternal, Unsearchable, and Immutable Being, who is the Author and Preserver of the Universe." This was the crowning act in the noble life of Rám Mohun Roy; a life which had been spent, first in an ardent and unremitting search after religious truth, and next, in the endeavour to wean his countrymen from the degradations of idolatry and the barbarities of widow-burning, and to promote their enlightenment and welfare to the utmost of his ability. Having at length seen his chief labours blessed with success, by the abolition of the Suttee in December, 1829, and the establishment of the Brahmo Somaj in January, 1830, his work was done. A few months later he sailed for England, whence his return was prevented by death, on September 27, 1833.

After this, his Church unavoidably languished for some years; but it was revived and virtually reconstructed by Debendra Náth Tagore, who carried it on to a far higher level of spiritual development, and also laid the foundations of its practical organisation as a religious community. An interesting sketch of his labours and character has been given by one whose memory goes back to this period. We have room only for a few of the main points.*

"By a variety of circumstances, quite unique and singular in their character, he was suddenly impressed, at the age of twenty, with the vanity of all earthly pleasures, and began a deep, earnest, and spiritual search into his own being, its wants and aspirations. As a consequence, his steps were led towards the Brahmo Somaj." He found that the movement had degenerated both as to doctrine and prac-

* *The New Dispensation and the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj.* By Pandit SIVA NATH SASTRI, M.A. Madras, 1881. Pp. 4-6, 10.

tical usefulness, and he set to work to give it life and consistency. In 1839 he started the *Tattvabodhini Sabhá*, or "Truth-teaching Society," for the dissemination of religious truths, and extended its operations by the establishment of schools in various places, and (in 1843) by the publication of a monthly journal, the *Tattvabodhini Patriká*, which soon became the best vernacular journal of its time, and still maintains a high reputation.

Along with the thoughts of these practical works, there were other thoughts of a deeper and more spiritual nature working in his mind. He found the Somaj as Rájá Rám Mohun Roy had left it, a mere platform, where people of different creeds used to assemble week after week to listen to the discourses and hymns. Men by joining it pledged nothing, incurred nothing, and lost nothing. Many who attended these services were idolaters at home, and, in fact, knew not what the spiritual worship of the One True God meant. He instantly applied himself to remove this spiritual want. He bound himself and his friends by a solemn covenant introduced in the year 1843, which, besides clearly laying down and defining the attributes of the Deity, enjoined, in the first place, a vow to cultivate a habit of daily prayer; secondly, a vow to give up idolatry. He was the first to sign this covenant, and many were the privations and bitter persecutions he had to suffer on account of this resolution. He describes in one of his lectures how he would wander away from his house, in sun and rain, on those days when the great goddess Durgá would be worshipped by his parents and relations, simply to avoid taking part, in the least, in any idolatrous ceremony.

After the introduction of this covenant, hundreds of new members were induced to sign it during the next six or seven years, and many branch Somajes were also established in many mofussil [provincial] stations.

Meanwhile another important change was approaching. Hitherto the Vedas had been tacitly acknowledged as the great authority in religious matters, but doubts began to arise on this point, and it was strongly urged that the grounds of belief in Vedic infallibility should be investigated.

Accordingly, Bábu Debendranáth Tá Gore deputed four young Brahmans, at his own cost, to proceed to Benares and to collect

and read the four Vedas, with a view to be able to correctly expound them after their return. The upshot of these fresh researches was, that the infallibility of the Vedas could not be any longer maintained. The Vedas were finally given up, leaving the creed of the Bráhma Somaj pure and simple Theism. After this great and important change, Bábu Debendranáth proceeded to revise the articles of his faith and to lay down those fundamental principles upon which the Adi Somaj at present stands. He also reframed a Theistic Covenant for the acceptance of his disciples, and published a remarkable book called, "*Bráhma Dharma* ; or, the Religion of the One True God," the best monument of his religious genius. It consists of Theistic selections from passages of the Upanishads, with his own commentaries. . . . Before his time, Brahmoism had existed as a mere matter of speculative thought. It was he who gave it the attractions of life, by teaching the secrets of prayer and spiritual communion. It was he who taught the Brahmos to worship God, as the "soul of their souls," and the "life of their lives," and in his own devout person he showed the way. We still vividly recollect the day, when we hung with profound respect and fond filial trust upon every word that fell from his venerable lips, and when a single sparkling glance of his eyes awakened strange emotions in our breasts, and made us feel that God was near. His deeply meditative nature, his warm and overflowing heart, his exquisitely-poetic temperament, and, above all, the saint-like purity of his life, all combined to make his Brahmoism a living reality, and to mark him out, even to this day, as the highest type of a truly devout character amongst us.

These extracts will give some idea of the amount of development which the Brahmo Somaj attained under the guidance of its second founder, a purely Hindu Theist of the noblest type.

Rám Mohun Roy cleared the ground and laid the foundation stone, but it was Debendra Náth Tagore who raised the first story of the superstructure ; and it was inevitable that that first stage should be substantially Hindu. The time, however, could not but arrive when wider vistas should be opened. To quote again from Pandit S. N. Sástri—"There was a body of young men, early inoculated with Christian

ideas, and trained in the school of Parker and Newman, who were longing for a broader and more comprehensive type. The *sense of sin* and *prayer*, first imbibed from Christian sources, had taken root in their hearts. The old Hindu type of piety was rather chilling and benumbing to their spirits. They were longing for getting away—doing God's good work in the world. . . . They boldly launched into social reforms, and the older party held back with doubts and misgivings." * At last, the divergences between the older and the younger parties became too wide to admit of harmonious co-operation, and the result was a secession of the younger Brahmos under Keshub Chunder Sen, who had joined the Brahmo Somaj in 1857, and between whom and Debendra Náth Tagore there had been a very close union in personal affection, and in the joint work of reform and development of the Church. The secession took place in February, 1865, and the seceders enrolled themselves in November, 1866, into a separate body entitled the "Bháratvarsya (or Indian) Brahmo Somaj," a title which was anglicised as the "Brahmo Somaj of India." At the meeting held for this purpose, Mr. Sen thus described the situation :—

We see around us a large number of Brahmo Somajes in different parts of the country for the congregational worship of the One True God, and hundreds upon hundreds of men professing the Brahmo faith; we have besides, Missionaries going about in all directions to preach the saving truth of Bráhma Dharma (Theism); books and tracts inculcating these truths are also being published from time to time. To unite all such Brahmos and form them into a body, to reduce their individual and collective labours into a vast, but well-organised system of unity and co-operation—this is all that is sought to be accomplished at the present meeting. Professing a common faith, it is our duty to combine for common good, and not to remain isolated from and be regardless of each other. We must endeavour to realise, as far as lies in our power, the true ideal of the Church of God; we must form a truly Theistic Brotherhood, a family

* *Brahmo Public Opinion*, August 4, 1881. "Development of Piety in the Brahmo Somaj."

of God's children, of which He is our common Father and Head; that holy Kingdom of Heaven of which He is the Eternal King.

During the next ten years, much was done which undoubtedly tended towards the realisation of this ideal in various ways. In 1866, a selection of Theistic texts was published, taken from the Hindu, Jewish, Christian, Mahometan, and Parsi Scriptures, and chiefly intended for public reading at the Somaj services. This book has passed through several editions, with successive enlargements; and the same has been the case with the *Brahmo Sangit*, or Hymn Book, which was issued by the Somaj. The two religious newspapers which had already been started before the schism, viz.:—the fortnightly *Dharma Tattva* (or "Religious Truth,") and the weekly *Indian Mirror* (which included secular subjects also) were well kept up and circulated, while the *Sangat Sabhá* (or "United Society"), for religious conversation, and the "Society of Theistic Friends" for theological discussion, were also continued—the former being an important instrument of spiritual culture, from which many later developments subsequently arose. A little "Bráhmica Somaj" was established for the ladies in 1865, and a Prayer-Hall or Church was at length built in Calcutta, and opened for regular Sunday worship in August, 1869. The next year, Mr. Sen paid a six months' visit to England, preaching here extensively, and with deservedly wide acceptance from men of various classes and creeds. When he returned home, he started a new Society, the "Indian Reform Association," for general educational and social improvement. This society was divided into five sections, viz.:—Female Improvement, General Education, Cheap Literature, Temperance, and Charity. In the first and fourth divisions a good deal was accomplished, the chief result being a Female Normal School which was fairly successful for several years. A popular weekly newspaper, the *Sulabh Samákhár* ("Cheap News") was started, which still exists, as does also, to some extent, the Charity section, for giving assistance to poor families or students.

Such was the work undertaken by the Brahmo Somaj of India in the metropolis, in addition to which the work of general propagandism was carried on with much zeal. A Mission Office had been opened in the year 1864, and a number of earnest and devout men had forsaken their secular employments and come forward to preach and propagate their faith all over the country. Their sufferings and privations at this early period were very great. Many of them came down from comfortable circumstances to poverty and want, and were sometimes obliged to go without even the bare necessities of life. But they worked on with unceasing devotedness, and to their zeal may be attributed a very large share of the progress made by the Brahmo Somaj throughout the country, especially in Bengal.

By this time, however, Brahmoism had begun to show itself in other parts of India also. In 1863 a Brahmo Somaj was started in Lahore by a few local Bengali residents, among whom one of the foremost was Babu Navina Chandra Ráy, a learned and philanthropic Brahmo, who has contributed largely to Theistic literature, and is still a distinguished member of the Punjáb Brahmo Somaj. In 1864 and 1867, Theistic churches were started in Madras and Bombay, under the respective titles of Veda Somaj and Prárthaná (Prayer) Somaj; but these, though doubtless stimulated by the example of Bengal, were organised independently, and it is important to note that both in Western and Southern India, the Theistic movement has ever since continued to develop almost entirely from local impulse, though in fraternal relations with the Eastern Theists. For a long while, however, the "Brahmo Somaj of India" undoubtedly held the foremost place in aspiring to a definite Brahmic ideal, which found a name in the term of "Progressive Brahmoism." The eloquent discourses of Mr. Sen, and the beneficial institutions under his direction, attracted wide-spread sympathy to the movement, even from those who dissented from the Brahmic creed. But the most notable and important achievement of Progressive Brahmoism was the Native

Marriage Act, passed in March, 1872, after nearly four years' agitation. By this Act, definite barriers were established, for all who would accept their shelter, against idolatry, polygamy, child-marriage, and (indirectly) caste; and the result has been to raise the moral and social level of life for a large and increasing portion of Indian society.

There is no doubt that a very great share of the credit due for this invaluable reform should be assigned to Keshub Chunder Sen, who, though assisted by others, was himself the chief organiser of the Brahmo-Marriage movement. But after leading the van of Progressive Brahmoism with conspicuous success for many years, K. C. Sen's sympathies began to turn in a different direction. The emotional Gospel of Vaishnavism, with its ecstasies and asceticisms, gained an increasing hold over his imagination; and, in corresponding ratio, the reformatory elements which he had previously cultivated were neglected more and more. How this reactionary wave at length carried him (together with other collateral influences) to the point of shirking his own hardly-won Marriage Act in order to give his child-daughter to a Hindu Prince—the ceremony being even performed (March 6, 1878) with quasi-idolatrous rites—and how this defection, and the plea of *adesh*, or "divine command," with which he defended it, caused a speedy breach with the majority of his own Church, is too well known to need more than a passing reference. What is not known, however, and needs to be told plainly, is the fact that this breach resulted in a fresh accession of strength to the cause of Progressive Brahmoism. For some years previously, Mr. Sen's modes of procedure and tone of preaching had been growing more and more divergent from the normal types of Brahmoism, to the serious pain and disappointment of many of the oldest members of the Church; and the absence of any regular constitution in the Somaj left all power in his hands, and acted like a dead-lock upon the activities of others. But his fatal error of the 6th of March broke the spell, and restored freedom to the Church. At first, it was

attempted to reorganise the "Brahmo Somaj of India," but as this soon proved impracticable, it was decided to reconstruct the Brahmo Church on an independent basis ; and on the 15th of May, 1878, at the Calcutta Town Hall, the chief Brahmos of the metropolis—supported by the official concurrence of twenty-nine provincial Somajes, the written declaration of 425 Brahmos and Bráhmicas, and the warmly-expressed sympathy of the venerable Debendra Náth Tágore—inaugurated the Sádháran (or Universal) Brahmo Somaj, "to secure the representation of the views and the harmonious co-operation of the general Brahmo community, in all that affects the progress and well-being of the Theistic cause and Theistic work in India."

This step was the initiative of a new period, which may be truly called a Brahmic revival. The springs of life were opened afresh, and the Bengal Theists worked with renewed hope and zeal for the realisation of their faith and the reconstruction of their Church. Determined to avoid the dangers of the "one-man rule," and anxious to rally as large a number for common work as possible, their first efforts were given to the establishment of a republican constitution ; and this has happily proved to be of a workable kind. The office-bearers (annually elected) are four in number—a president, secretary, assistant-secretary, and treasurer. These act in conjunction with a General Committee, composed of forty persons elected at the annual general meeting of members, and of such representatives from the Provincial Somajes as the latter have previously elected or confirmed. This General Committee, in its turn, appoints twelve of its members as an Executive Committee for the year, who meet every week, and by whom all the actual work is performed, subject to revision at quarterly meetings by the General Committee, who are themselves ultimately responsible to the general body of members. By this arrangement the chief rule practically resides with the Executive Committee, who are chosen from the most active and experienced members of the Somaj, and who, while fully responsible to the general body, are yet quite free to

act efficiently as its accredited managers. At the same time, the annual elections render it easy to vary the actual *personnel* of the Committee, and to utilize the floating margin of newer men who may come forward as older members retire. Thus various ideas come to the front, and different capacities are tested in turn—a flexibility of plan which has great advantages.

The amount of work that has been accomplished by the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj in the course of its five-and-a-half years' existence is most encouraging to all its well-wishers. The first requisite was a Prayer Hall, or Church, in Calcutta. For this a good site in Cornwallis Street was secured, and the foundation stone was laid in January, 1879, before the Somaj had completed its first year; and at the January Anniversary Festival of 1881 the building was opened for regular service. On each of these occasions a Statement of Principles was read aloud in three languages successively,—English, Bengali, and Urdu, and was received by the assembled congregation with deep and vivid sympathy. The second and fuller edition of this Statement, read at the opening of the Church, was as follows:—

This day, the 10th day of Mágh, 1287, according to the Bengáli era, and the 22nd of January, 1881, according to the Christian era, in the fifty-first year of the Brahmo Somaj, we dedicate this Hall to the worship of the One True God. From this day its doors shall be open to all classes of people without distinction of caste or social position. Men or women, old or young, wise or ignorant, rich or poor, all classes will meet here as brethren to worship Him who is the author of our salvation. This great, holy, Supreme God alone shall be worshipped here, to the exclusion of every created person or thing; and no divine honours shall be paid to any man or woman as God, or equal to God, or an incarnation of God, or as specially appointed by God. It shall be ever borne in mind in this Hall that the great mission of Brahmoism is to promote spiritual freedom amongst men, and to enable them to establish direct relationship with God, and the sermons, discourses, and prayers of this place shall be so moulded as to help that spirit. It shall ever be its aim and endeavour to

enable all who thirst after righteousness, to know God, who is the Life of our life, and to worship Him direct.

The catholicity of Brahmoism shall also be preserved here. No book or man shall ever be acknowledged as infallible and the only way to salvation; but nevertheless due respect shall be paid to all scriptures and the good and great of all ages and all countries. In the sermons, discourses, and prayers used in this Hall, no scripture, or sect, or founder of a sect, shall ever be ridiculed, reviled, or spoken of contemptuously. With due respect, untruth shall be exposed and truth vindicated. No man or class of men shall be here regarded as the elect or favourite of God, and the rest of mankind as lost to that favour. Anything calculated to compromise this catholic spirit shall never be countenanced.

The spirituality of our doctrine shall be carefully maintained. Flowers, spices, burnt-offerings, candles, and other material accompaniments of worship shall never be used, and care shall be taken to avoid everything tending to reduce religion to mere parade and lifeless forms.

It shall be the object of all our preachings and discourses in this place to teach men and women to love God, to seek piety, to hate sin, to grow in devotion and spirituality, to promote purity amongst men and women, to uproot all social evils, and to encourage virtuous deeds. Anything that will directly or indirectly encourage idolatry, engender superstition, take away spiritual freedom, lower conscience, or corrupt morals, shall never be countenanced. May this Hall ever remain a refuge and resting-place for all the weary sojourners of this world! May the sinner find consolation and hope in this Hall; may the weak be strengthened, and may all who hunger and thirst find food and drink for their souls. With this hope and prayer we dedicate this Hall in the name of the One True God. May He help and guide us. Amen.*

The regular congregational services in the Prayer Hall are attended by an average congregation of 500 persons, and are held every Sunday evening, with the addition of a morning service on the first Sunday in every Bengali month. Besides these, other services are held at various times,

* *Fourth Annual Report of the Sâdhâran Brahmo-Somaj*, pp. 2, 3. Calcutta. 1882.

and on some special occasions the church is crowded. Three festivals are held every year; the anniversary of the founding of the Brahmo Somaj by Rám Mohun Roy, on the 23rd of January; the Bengali New Year's-day, on the 13th of April; and the birthday of the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj, on the 15th of May. The first and greatest of these festivals usually extends over more than a week, and includes the annual gatherings of the various religious institutions of the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj in Calcutta. Of these there are several, and it is important to note that they are not the creation of any one master-mind, imposing its ordinances upon passive followers, but are the natural and spontaneous outcome of many hearts, seeking after God and yearning to know and serve Him.

(1.) The oldest of these institutions is the *Sangat Sabhá*, or United Society. This is a weekly conversational meeting for spiritual progress and mutual help, the subjects discussed being generally matters of individual spiritual experience. This Society does not at present contain a very large number of regular members, but it is said to be very helpful to the spiritual growth of those who take part in it. The original *Sangat Sabhá* was started by K. C. Sen before the first schism, and proved a very fruitful institution; and similar societies have since been introduced in most of the large Somajes. The following kindred institutions, however, are peculiar to the Sádharan Somaj.

(2.) The Students' Weekly Service, established in April, 1879, which soon attracted a large number of attendants, and has continued to be popular ever since. Its objects are " (1) to stimulate religious inquiry, (2) to induce thoughtfulness and earnestness of character, and (3) to create interest in questions of religious and social reform amongst young men "; and it appears to have made genuine progress in the realisation of these aims, one notable result being that a large number of young members have definitely joined the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj and publicly discarded caste and idolatry, manfully accepting the painful consequences which follow such renunciation.

(3.) The Students' Prayer-meeting, dating from 1880. This is for younger students, who meet every Wednesday evening for prayer and spiritual advancement. As a general rule, the members conduct the services themselves, and some of them issue a little fortnightly journal, which is said to be very useful—the *Dharma Bandhu*, or Friend of Religion.

(4.) The Theological Institution, for lectures followed by discussion, was opened near the close of 1881, with a number of students belonging to different schools and colleges in Calcutta. Its main object is "to ground its members in theology and practical piety."

(5.) The two-fold Society of Ladies known as the Bráhmica Somaj—which is exclusively for Brahma ladies—and the Banga Mahilá Somaj or Bengal Ladies' Association, in which the same ladies are joined by non-Brahmo members. The ladies meet every week, the first and third Saturdays in each month being allotted to prayer-meetings, and the intermediate Saturday to the reading of original papers, followed by discussion; while on the fourth Saturday popular lectures are delivered on scientific, historical, or biographical subjects, and a selection of interesting news on current events is read aloud. These lectures and selections are given by gentlemen, and the social gathering of the Society, which is held once in three months, is also open to guests of both sexes. But except on these occasions the Society's meetings are nearly always restricted to ladies, who usually conduct their own religious services, and always write the essays which are read and discussed. In short, this Somaj is not a mere benevolent institution managed by men for the improvement of women, but a genuine effort of self-development on the part of the women themselves. Established in August, 1879, it has continued steadily ever since, and has done much useful work in various ways.

In addition to these Societies for the religious and intellectual culture of adults, the Sádháran Brahmos have done much for general education in its earlier stages. In January, 1879, the City School for the higher education of boys was

opened in Calcutta, under the rectorship of Mr. Ananda M. Bose, B.A. Cantab., then President of the Sádharan Somaj. In January, 1881, it was converted into a College, and affiliated to the Calcutta University up to the standard of the First Arts examination: and in January, 1883, the affiliation was extended to the study of Law. The Annual Reports of this institution are most interesting, as recording the progress of a thoroughly sound experiment, and its increasing range, both intellectual and moral. The teaching staff consists of twenty-three gentlemen, and the managing committee consists of seven leading Brahmos. The maximum number of pupils on the rolls, including both the School and the College departments, has increased yearly, from 449 in 1880 to 866 in 1883. The institution has thriven from the first, and the proportion of students who have passed well at the University Examinations has always been high. Last December (1882), when the College sent up candidates for the first time to the First Arts examination, it passed 23 out of 51, the highest percentage of all the eight competing colleges of Calcutta on that occasion. And this year the success of the newly-opened Law classes is evidenced by the passing of the Tagore Law examination and the winning of the University's gold and silver medals on the part of two students of the College.

But this excellent institution is not content with intellectual and financial success. Special efforts are made to awaken and appeal to the moral nature of those under instruction and to strengthen their character, by making them familiar with noble examples and high moral lessons, and by the free discussion of important questions; and there is gratifying testimony to the good that has been done in this direction.

Thus far, the ethical teaching of the Sádharan Somaj did not go beyond the secular sphere. But in November, 1879, some of the young Sádharan Brahmos started a little Sunday-school for boys at the City School premises, in which moral instruction was regularly imparted; and in addition to this, a definitely Theological Class was opened

in 1882 for the benefit of more advanced students. "It ought to be added," says the Report for 1881, "that these two institutions, though held in the school premises and attended by many students of the school, are independent of any connection with the school itself." This is, of course, quite just, as the institution is avowedly open to pupils of all creeds. But both the official and the unofficial teaching really spring from the same spiritual root, and conduce to make the City College a valuable auxiliary to the Sádharan Brahmo movement.

Besides the Sunday-school just mentioned, Sunday gatherings of little children are regularly held in the Prayer-Hall every Sunday afternoon, when after a short brief service and hymn, discourses are delivered, suitable to the juvenile congregation. The present secretary of the Somaj, Babu Dwárákáth Gánguli, and Babu Sasipada Bánerji, have the principal charge of these gatherings, in which, we hear, both the children and their parents take an increasing interest.

It should be added that the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj has a Theistic Library and Reading-room, which is said to be "silently promoting a habit of thoughtful study among the younger members of the Somaj." The Bengal Ladies' Association has also a Library and Reading-room, and the City College has a Library and a Reading Club.

Of representative periodicals there are several. The Bengal organ of the Somaj is the *Tattva Kaumudi* (or Moonlight of Knowledge), issued on the 1st and 16th of every Bengali month; the English organ is now the *Indian Messenger*, issued every Sunday morning. These two journals are devoted to religious subjects. The *Bámá-bodhiny Patriká* (or Teacher of Women) is a monthly magazine for ladies, which has long been deservedly popular. It is edited by the Secretary to the City College, Babu Umesh Chandra Datta, B.A. The *Sakhá*, or Companion, is a monthly magazine for children, started last January (1883), and edited by Babu Pramadá Charan Sen, one of the teachers of the Sunday-school, and is a very

hopeful attempt. The little fortnightly *Dharma Bandhu* (or Friend of Religion), edited by the Sádharan students, has already been mentioned.

Such are the most prominent features of the institutions which have been established in Calcutta by the members of the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj. The testimony which they bear to a genuine spirit of life, thirsting for "more life and fuller," cannot be mistaken; and the heart of it all is religion, blossoming forth in various directions. But the organisation of Brahmoism in Calcutta was only one part of the programme which (true to its name of *Sádharan*, or Universal) aimed at the diffusion of Brahmoism all over the country. Missionary tours began from the first year, and were very helpful in spreading a knowledge of the Sádharan revival among the provincial Somajes. In 1879, a Mission Committee was appointed to superintend the nomination of missionaries and the training of candidates for mission work. An interesting ceremony took place in January, 1880, when the first four missionaries were publicly ordained at the Anniversary Festival, or *Utsab*, in the (then half-completed) Prayer Hall, which was made available for the occasion.

The following taken from the Annual Report for that year is a translation of a portion of the charge addressed to the missionaries in the name of the Executive Committee of the Somaj.*

"Beloved and esteemed brethren!

"Neither by word of mouth nor by example should you ever encourage idolatry on the one hand or godlessness on the other. God alone being truth, never preach any man or any class of men as infallible or as the best or highest means of salvation. Directly or indirectly, never countenance any doctrine of mediation between God and man. Never engage yourselves in any undertaking which is calculated even remotely to loosen the bonds of morality or to lower the standard of purity of the relation of the sexes. Never encourage caste or priestly pride

* Both in this translation and in that of the previous Statement of Principles, I have corrected a few phrases in which the English rendering was at fault.

by precept or example. If, through excess of veneration, you find people paying you extraordinary and divine honours, never accept them. Never take part in social ceremonies involving sacrifice of conscience or purity. While preaching, never throw ridicule or contempt on other sects or scriptures. In whatever you do or say, let your aim and endeavour be to conquer untruth by truth, hatred by love, and sin by righteousness. Mix freely with all classes and all creeds in all social and philanthropic undertakings, taking care, of course, to keep the principles of Brahmoism uninjured. In your daily lives and in all your domestic and social relations, take care to maintain the high ideal of Brahmo life, unimpaired. Instances are not rare where preachers and spiritual teachers of mankind have made their calling a source of gain and personal aggrandisement; it need scarcely be said, you will scornfully shun such paths. The preaching and propagation of religion will ever remain your chief and primary occupation, but it will also be lawful for you to take part in all political, social, scientific, and literary movements. Whilst serving as our missionary, you may, if duty requires, earn money by any secular work, but you will have to wait for our sanction. You will have the liberty of leaving the mission work of the Sádharán Brahmo Somaj when you choose, but so long as you willingly agree to serve the Somaj you are to regard your brethren, the members of the Somaj, as the judges of your character and work.

"With these solemn requests and injunctions, we ordain you this day in the name of the most Holy God. Go and serve your brethren and sisters, placing your main reliance on His mercy and His aid, and always leaning upon His Holy will. May your humble efforts be crowned with success; your lives be examples of piety and purity in the land; your tongues be successful in carrying the glad tidings here and abroad, and your thoughts and aspirations be always directed to Heaven! This is our humble prayer. So help you God."

From the sketch we have given, the reader will be able to perceive what are the principles and purposes of the Sádharán Brahmos, and what sort of leaven they are endeavouring to introduce into the surrounding Hindu society; and the fulness to which the Sádharán organisation has extended is an unmistakable evidence of its having attained a considerable amount of sympathy and support. About thirty of the

provincial Somajes are definitely affiliated to it, and send their representatives to its General Committee. There are also many members of the Somaj who reside in the provinces, and act as its accredited agents for the sale of books and papers, or the collecting of subscriptions. The actual number of registered members is under 800; but it commands the sympathy and co-operation of many who are not its actual members; and its missionaries are cordially received wherever their travels have led them—from Assam to Sindh, and from Lahore to Madras. Nor is missionary work confined to a separate class; many Sádharan Brahmos whose occupations are secular, devote a large amount of their time to Theistic propagandism, either by preaching tours, religious class-teaching, or visitation. This zealous activity is especially to be noted among the Calcutta students, who often utilise their vacations in this manner.

Now it will be seen on a comparison of all these facts with the brief account already given of the early years of the "Brahmo Somaj of India," that the lines of progress then opened have simply been resumed by the Sádharan Brahmo Somaj, after the interlude of a contrary character which intervened between, and are now being carried on with extended range. Of course the provincial Somajes are on a small scale, and very few of them approach the metropolitan Somaj in maturity of development; but they usually contain some of the most intelligent and active residents in their several localities, and often owe to these their main support, if not their origin. The first germ, from which all the rest follows, is usually the idea of United Prayer. "They met and agreed to offer their prayers together" is the almost unfailing commencement of the history of any Brahmo Somaj. This first stage is called a Prayer-Meeting, and where the members are weak or timid, it is often a long time before they have the courage to raise it into a definite "Brahmo Somaj," which term is evidently understood to imply the adoption of a Theistic standard, more or less at variance with the surrounding Hinduism, and therefore

liable to excite opposition. The normal type of the Brahmo Churches, when fully developed, includes the three departments of Religion, Philanthropy, and Education ; but these are developed with great variety of combination in the several Somajes. In Calcutta and Dacca, the predominance of the collegiate element gives a more decisively intellectual character to the local Brahmo institutions, while the larger number of adherents (the East Bengal Somaj at Dacca counting 90 registered members, including seven ladies), renders the Brahmos more strong to hold their own ground in various ways. Dacca is, however, an exceptional case, no other Brahmo Somaj in Bengal being so large, except Bágháchrá, which has 92 members, being in fact a Brahmo village, the history of whose conversion in 1863-64 is one of the notable episodes in Brahmo history. But good work is being done in several of the smaller Bengal Somajes, as may be seen by reference to the numerous Provincial Reports given in my *Brahmo Year-Books* for 1880 and 1882. These, of course, include Somajes which are not specially in harmony with the Sádharán Somaj. Berhampur, Midnapur, and some others adhere to the general views of the Adi Somaj ; while Bhágálpur, Chittagong, and the actively propagandist " Branch Brahmo Somaj of India " at Dacca, are, with several more, attached to the leadership of Mr. Sen. Others again, are avowedly neutral on controversial questions. But speaking generally, it may safely be said that the majority of the Bengal Somajes adhere to the cause of Progressive Brahmoism, and that the more decided of these recognise that that cause has found its ablest advocacy and strongest defence in the Sádharán Brahmo Somaj.

We must now pass beyond Bengal, and take up the threads of Brahmie history in the sister presidencies of Madras and Bombay. The first episode in the history of Madras Brahmoism is a very noble one, which is scarcely known here at all, and is worth giving in detail, especially as the individuals chiefly concerned have now passed beyond the reach of earthly comment.

It must have been in the course of the year 1863 that a young man named K. Sridharalu Naidu, who appears to have been a native of Cuddalore in the Madras Presidency, heard of the existence of the (then undivided) Brahmo Somaj in Bengal, and was greatly stirred by the news—so much so that he felt it his duty to go to the centre of the Brahmo movement and make himself fully acquainted with it. Being very poor, he had to dispose of his small property in order to pay his passage thither. He had no recommendations or friends in Bengal, and could not speak either Bengali or Hindustani, and when he landed in Calcutta his whole vocabulary of what he came to seek consisted in the words "the Brahmo Somaj" and "Jorasanko," (the suburb in which the Somaj was then located). But he had sufficient knowledge of English to make himself understood by the English-speaking Brahmos, and "there was about his face and manners an earnestness, simplicity, and intelligence that could not be mistaken." He applied himself with energy and perseverance to the work for which he had come, and having acquired, within about eight months, a full knowledge of Brahmoism "in Bengali, Sanscrit, and English," he resolved to devote his life to its propagation in Southern India. One of the Brahmo missionaries wrote as follows (*Sunday Mirror*, Sept. 6th, 1874), in recollection of this time; "Those who have once seen him in Calcutta can, I dare say, never forget him. . . He lived with our missionary friends, slept and dined with them, and indeed was one of them. We well remember the solemn occasion when, in the small room of the late Calcutta College, with tears and supplication and with a solemn lifting of our eyes to God we gave him the heartiest farewell, and like the apostle of old, we saw him in a ship bound for the field of his labour (Madras)."

It must have been somewhat before this farewell scene that Mr. Sen paid his first visit to Madras in February, 1864, and delivered several lectures there which produced considerable effect. In consequence of this a Society was established in the following April under the name of the

Veda Somaj, which held weekly prayer-meetings, started a monthly journal, and otherwise displayed much religious activity. The leaders of this movement were Messrs. V. Rájagopal Charlu and P. Subrayalu Chetty, both well-known members of the Madras bar; and while they lived the movement thrived, and several other Somajes were founded,—in Tanjore, Coimbatore, Salem, Bangalore, and other towns in Southern India. But in the year 1868 these two leaders were both removed by death, and for some time the Somaj suffered greatly in consequence. Then the quiet worker who had hitherto passed unnoticed, came to the front, and after a while Sridharalu Naidu was appointed secretary to the Madras Somaj. He had not the advantages of position and education which had been possessed by his predecessors, but he appears to have had a much stronger grasp of Theistic principle, and not feeling satisfied with the half-measure of a "*Veda Somaj*," he at length succeeded in converting the Society into "*The Brahmo Somaj of Southern India*." This was finally settled at a meeting of the Somaj held on June 18, 1871. The rules of the Somaj were revised, and the old "*Covenants of the Veda Somaj*" were replaced by a confession of faith which was doubtless written by Sridharalu Naidu. The two declarations represent so typically the first and the second stages of Madras Brahmoism, and the striking contrast between them, that I give them here in full.

COVENANTS OF THE VEDA SOMAJ.

1. I shall worship, through love of Him and the performance of the work He loveth, the Supreme Being, the Creator, the Preserver, the Destroyer, the Giver of Salvation, the Omniscient, the Omnipotent, the Blissful, the Good, the Formless, the One only without a second; and none of the created objects, subject to the following conditions.

2. I shall labour to compose and gradually bring into practice a Ritual agreeable to the spirit of pure Theism, and free from the superstitions and absurdities which at present characterise Hindu ceremonies.

3. In the mean time I shall observe the ceremonies now in

use, but only in cases where ceremonies are indispensable, as in marriages and funerals; or where their omission will do more violence to the feelings of the Hindu community than is consistent with the proper interests of the Veda Somaj, as in *Srāddhas*. And I shall go through such ceremonies, where they are not conformable to pure Theism, as mere matters of routine, destitute of all religious significance—as the lifeless remains of a superstition which has passed away.

4. This sacrifice, and this only, shall I make to existing prejudices. But I shall never endeavour to deceive any one as to my religious opinions, and never stoop to equivocation or hypocrisy, in order to avoid unpopularity.

5. I shall discard all sectarian views and animosities, and never offer any encouragement to them.

6. I shall, as a first step, gradually give up all distinctions, and amalgamate the different branches of the same caste.

7. Rigidly as I shall adhere to all these rules, I shall be perfectly tolerant to the views of strangers, and never intentionally give offence to their feelings.

8. I shall never violate the duties and virtues of humanity, justice, veracity, temperance, and chastity.

9. I shall never hold, or attend, or pay for nautches, or otherwise hold out encouragement for prostitution.

10. I shall encourage and promote to the best of my power the re-marriage of widows, and discourage early marriages.

11. I shall never be guilty of bigamy or polygamy.

12. I shall grant my aid towards the issue, in the vernaculars, of elementary prayer-books and religious tracts; and also of a monthly journal, whose chief object shall be to improve the social and moral condition of the community.

13. I shall advance the cause of general and female education and enlightenment, and particularly in my own family circle.

14. I shall study the Sanscrit language and its literature (especially theological), and promote the cultivation of it by means not calculated to promote superstition.

To-day, being the day of the month of of the Kályābdā , I hereby embrace the faith of the Veda Somaj, and in witness whereof set my hand to this.*

* *Six Months in India*, by Mary Carpenter. Vol. I., pp. 157-8. Miss Carpenter gives a very interesting account of her visit to the Veda Somaj in November, 1866, and of her conversations with the then Secretary, Mr. P. S. Chetty, and his intelligent young wife. It was from him that she obtained the above Covenants.

COVENANTS OF THE SOUTHERN INDIA BRAHMO SOMAJ.

1. I will worship, through love of Him and the performance of the works He loveth, the Supreme Being, the Creator, the Preserver, the Giver of Salvation, the Omniscient, the Omnipotent, the Blissful, the Good, the Formless, the One only without a second, and none of the created objects.

2. I will look for Divine wisdom and instruction to the Book of Nature, and to that Intuition and Inspiration of God which give all men understanding. I do not consider any book or any man as the infallible guide in religion, but I do accept with respect and pleasure any truth contained in any book or uttered by any man without paying exclusive reverence to any.

3. I believe in the immortality and progressive state of the soul, and in a state of conscious existence succeeding life in this world and supplementary to it.

4. I will daily direct my mind in prayer with devotion and love unto the Supreme Being.

5. I will endeavour strictly to adhere to the duties and virtues of humanity, justice, veracity, temperance, and chastity.

6. Believing as I do in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, I will discard all sectarian views and animosities, and never offer any encouragement to them.

7. Should I through folly commit sin, I will endeavour to be atoned unto God by earnest repentance and reformation.

8. Every year, and on the occasion of every happy domestic event of mine, I will bestow gifts upon the Southern India Brahmo Somaj.

This day, being the day of the month of of the Brahmic Era (), I, by the grace of God, do hereby declare my faith in *Brahmism*, and in witness whereof, I set my hand to these covenants of my own free will and consent. So help me God. Om.*

Both of these documents are based upon the original Brahmic Covenant of Debendra Náth Tágore; but the Veda-Somaj version reproduces little beyond the first paragraph, and half paralyses that by the added clause—"subject to the following conditions." Sridharalu Naidu's version not only omits this clause and its melancholy

* *Indian Mirror*, July 22, 1871. Om "is the emblem of the Most High." *Laws of Manu*, II., 83.

amplifications, but simply ignores the surrounding beliefs and customs altogether, and instead of dating by the *Kályābdā*, i.e., the "black period" (or iron age) of Hindu history, he starts a new "Brahmic Era,"—a system which has latterly come into frequent use among the Bengali Brahmos,—dating, of course, from the original establishment of Rām Mohun Roy's Brahmo Somaj, in January, 1830. There is also a far deeper vein of spiritual faith in this second series of Covenants than in that of the Veda Somaj. Herein Sridharalu wisely went back to the Covenant of D. N. Tagore, from which, and from another well-known Adi Somaj statement of beliefs,* he has mainly taken his 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 7th paragraphs; but he has frequently altered the original materials, and has, in fact, recast the whole so as to make it a definite and consistent ideal of Progressive Brahmoism.

About the same time he gave a practical proof of the new policy adopted by the Southern India Brahmo Somaj by drawing up on its behalf a memorial to the Viceroy in favour of the Brahmo Marriage Bill then pending before the Indian Legislature; and shortly afterwards he officiated at the first Brahmo marriage which took place in Madras, September 29th, 1871.

Sridharalu also exerted himself to bring the best productions of Brahmo literature within the reach of his own countrymen. He translated Debendra Nath Tagore's standard work, the *Brāhma Dharma*, into Tamil and Telugu, and published a Tamil translation of Mr. Sen's excellent *Model Form of Divine Worship*. Besides writing these (and, I believe, other works), he revived the monthly (Madras) *Thathvabothini Patrikā* (which had collapsed after the death of his predecessors), and conducted it as "the organ of all the Brahmists in Southern India."

Here, however, it should be noted that there was another active member of the late Veda Somaj, who took a prominent part in Brahmo affairs about this time. This was

* For this statement see *A Brief History of the Calcutta Brahmo Somaj*. Calcutta, 1868.

Cási Visvanátha Mudeliar, a retired judge, "of noble parentage," who conducted the services at one of the Brahmo prayer-rooms, and was the author of many Tamil books and of several popular plays which exposed the superstitions and vices prevalent in Southern India. He owned a little vernacular journal called the *Brahmo Dipiká*, which he edited himself, and which appears to have been the organ of his own views. What those views were it is not easy to discover from the enigmatical hints in the newspapers of the time (except that he appears to have been against the Brahmo Marriage Bill), nor is it worth while to revive the ashes of the dead controversies which for a time caused some dissensions in the Madras Somaj. Suffice to say that after having been regarded by his admirers as "the leader of the Madras Brahmos," Cási Visvanátha's Brahmoism came to an end, and he became a Pantheist, apparently not long before his death, which occurred in October, 1871.

Meanwhile Sridharalu Naidu continued to work unremittingly at his post. Occasional glimpses of his proceedings appear in the *Indian Mirror* of the time, especially in its issues of Feb. 2 and March 11, 1872, containing two letters of his concerning some projects for the benefit of the South Indian Brahmos. These letters (which are in very good English) bear witness alike to his enthusiastic faith and his practical good sense. We also find that he made divers missionary tours to various parts of the Presidency, —Bangalore, Mangalore, Tanjore, Trichinopoly, &c., "sowing quietly and perseveringly the seeds of Theism in the midst of the thick darkness of ignorance and superstition." All this time he suffered greatly from poverty. "He had a very old mother to take care of, and a wife, both of whom were against him in all his views and practices, and caused him no little pain. He was often at a loss how to support them, and was at times obliged to put up with hardships which it is not possible to describe. He never complained, he never asked, he never even acquainted his friends in Calcutta with his circumstances. Alone he suffered,

depended, prayed and worked, and God alone watched the deep trials and sorrows in the midst of which he lived."*

At last the end came. In January 1874, he went to visit some of his relatives at Pondicherry, near which town there was a temple—probably Chillambram—which he wished to see, in order to ascertain whether it would be suitable as a model for the "Brahmic Hall" which he wanted to erect in Madras. On this journey he was thrown out of a carriage, the horse having taken fright,—and terribly injured. He was taken to Pondicherry hospital, but no skill could save him, and after lingering for about twelve days he died, calm and faithful to the last. He left behind him a touching letter in English, headed, "Memo : to friends in the last hour," and signed "K. Sridharalu, Pondicherry, the 15th Jan. 1874." In this letter, addressed to twelve friends, he requested them to take care of his family, and gave his advice on the affairs of his Church, which evidently lay very near his heart. It may be noted that while the funerals of the previous Madras Secretaries were conducted in regular Hindu style, with those idolatrous funeral rites which, even in their Veda Somaj Covenant, they had not the courage to renounce, Sridharalu Naidu distinctly wrote with his own hand ;—" My funeral should be simple, with only Brahmic prayers. . . . I die a devoted Brahmo." Thus closed one of the purest lives ever given to the service of God.

The next secretary of the Madras Somaj scarcely survived his predecessor by a year, and it was not until the end of 1878 that the Somaj really began to revive. Under fresh hands, three years of fair prosperity followed ; after which, unhappily, a contention arose as to the soundness of the views preached respectively by the missionaries of Mr. Sen and those of the Sádharan Somaj. The result was a split, those who sided with the Sádharan Somaj forming a separate society as a branch of that body,—formally inaugurated as such on June 17, 1882. Its secretary is Mr. M. Butchiah Pantulu, who is a man of energy and resource, and is doing

* *Sunday Mirror*, Feb. 8, 1874.

his best to make Brahmoism successful in Madras. Regular Sunday evening services, with sermons in Tamil, Telugu, or English : a monthly journal in those three languages, entitled the *Brahma Prakasika* ; pamphlets, original or translated, on the history and principles of Brahmoism ; a Ragged School, a Theistic Library and three Brahmo marriages (none having taken place there between 1871 and 1882);—such are the results that have already accrued from Mr. Pantulu's labours. He is now endeavouring to collect funds for the purchase of a Prayer Hall, which would be a great assistance to the cause.

The South Indian members of the Sádharan Somaj number thirty-five, of whom seventeen reside in Madras ; but there are seven other towns in the presidency at which Somajes exist, the members of which are all Brahmos, but are not, as a rule, connected with either of the three Calcutta centres,—while there are also many isolated Brahmos who do not belong to any of the local congregations. Thus it will be seen that Brahmoism has undoubtedly gained an independent foothold in Southern India ; but has not as yet attained to mature local organisation.

Of the other Somajes, the oldest are those at Mangalore (1870) and Bangalore, at which latter station there are four prayer meetings in different parts of the town, dating respectively from 1867, 1871, 1878, and 1879. Here much excellent work has been done, the details of which will be found in my *Brahmo Year-Books* for 1876, 1877, 1880, and 1882. I can only refer here to the Girls' School, established in 1871, which has thriven ever since,—and to the good service rendered by the Bangalore Brahmos during the famine of 1877, by the opening of a relief kitchen, the funds for which were sent up by Brahmos and Brahmo Somajes in various parts of India to the Brahmo Mission Office at Calcutta, whence they were transmitted to Bangalore. The wide and ready response made by the general Brahmo community to the appeals of Mr. Sen for their starving countrymen in the South, and the systematic management and thoughtful kindness with which the relief was administered by the

Bangalore leaders (as was shown in detail by official correspondence) were most honourable to all parties concerned.

Many more episodes could be given of South Indian Brahmoism, but space forbids any further detail, except that six Brahmo periodicals are issued in the presidency, two of which are published at Bangalore. One of these is in Canarese; all the rest are in either Tamil or Telugu, combined with English.

The complete change of mental and social climate which we find in passing from Southern to Western India forcibly reminds us how various are the nationalities comprised in that great country to which we give the single name of India. The learned, sober-minded, and wealthy Marathi and Guzerati Theists of the Bombay Presidency are as different from their struggling co-religionists of Madras as those of Bengal are from both the other groups. The Bombay Theists first began to organise in March, 1867, when they established a *Prārthanā Somaj* in Bombay city, under the auspices of Dr. Atmaram Pandurang, a respected and philanthropic physician, who still resides there and assists the movement. Since then, many other *Prārthanā Somajes* have been established in the presidency, most of which are still extant. The most efficient of these are at Puná (1870), Ahmedabád (1871), and Surát (1878). The only existing branch which has taken the name of *Brahmo Somaj* is the small one at Hyderabad, Sindh, which has always kept up a special, though not an official, relationship with the Brahmo Somaj of India at Calcutta. In my *Brahmo Year-Books* for 1880 and 1882 I have published a number of reports from all the above-mentioned Somajes, which cannot be condensed here. They contain no romantic episodes, no revolutionary changes; the annals of Bombay Theism flow on in an even tenor from the beginning to the present time, without a break. There is much to admire in the liberal philanthropy which has established orphanages at Pandharpur and Ahmedabád, night-schools for working people at Bombay, and prison-visiting at Hyderabad; and the high culture and literary ability of some of the Bombay

Theists bear witness to their position among the intellectual nobility of India. An instance of this may be seen in the fine address delivered by Professor Bhandarkar at the last anniversary of the Puná Prárthaná Somaj (reported on pp. 49-53 of my *Brahmo Year-Book* for 1882), which touches the high-water mark of Bombay Theism, and is an altogether noble utterance of religious thought.

It should be noted that some approach towards federal organisation is gradually taking place among the Theists of Western India, the parent Somaj in Bombay city having been for some time endeavouring to bring the provincial Somajes into closer relations with itself and with each other. Several of them send up their annual reports to be read at the Bombay anniversary festival; and some individual members are collecting a Mission Fund for collective propagandist and philanthropic work. Such approaches towards fuller organisation must be welcomed by all friends of the movement. The Theism of Western India has its own special characteristics, and a distinct organisation would be very helpful in promoting its development, so as to strengthen its weak points while giving increased scope to its strong ones. It has never detached itself so far from the Hindu elements of Brahmoism as the Progressive Brahmos of Bengal and Madras have done, and both in religious observances and social customs, it clings far more closely to the old models. There is a minority among the Bombay Theists who are anxious to go much farther than the rest in these matters, and some of them have even married with Brahmic rites; but it is a significant fact that during the sixteen years which have elapsed since the establishment of the Bombay Somaj, only *four* such marriages have been celebrated among its members (there was a fifth marriage at Bombay, but both parties were Bengali visitors),—while in the same period there have been seven Brahmo marriages among the small communities of Southern India, and fifty-six in the single city of Calcutta. And here it is necessary to say a few words on the general subject of *Anusthāns*, or domestic ceremonies, and their relation to Brahmoism.

It would appear at first sight that the renunciation of idolatry and polytheism must, as a matter of course, entail the cessation of all ceremonies in which idols or false gods are invoked. But such invocations are interwoven in all the domestic rites, or *Anusthâns* of Hindu life, from birth to death. A consistent Brahmo, therefore, must not only absent himself from Hindu temple-worship, or grand idolatrous festivals, but must also renounce the Hindu rites performed on occasions of birth, marriage, death, &c., and must have Brahmic *Anusthâns* performed in their place, and one who does this is called an *Anusthânic Brahmo*. It will be remembered how the "Covenants of the Veda Somaj" shrank from the pains and penalties of this course, and how simply Sridharalu Naidu ignored the "necessity" of such compliance. This is just the point at which the *Prârthanâ Somajists* of Bombay (with some noble exceptions) fall short; and while such is the case, we must sorrowfully own that one essential element of their religion is conspicuous by its absence.

A census of the *Anusthânic Brahmos* of India was taken on November 15th, 1880, by order of the Executive Committee of the *Sâdhâran Somaj*, and although from various causes, all the returns were not sent in, and the register is consequently incomplete, it is a most valuable document so far as it goes. The list includes natives of most of the provinces of India, the preponderating majority being, of course, Bengalis. The *Anusthânic*s are scattered very irregularly over the country,—some Brahmo villages containing many, while some far more cultivated *Somajes* contain but few. The organization which contains most is undoubtedly the *Sâdhâran Somaj*, whose rules require that all its preachers, office-bearers, Executive Committee, and at least fifteen members of its General Committee, should be *Anusthânic*.

These outlines and episodes are but fragmentary, and unavoidably omit much that is necessary to a comprehensive view of the Brahmo movement. But they may help to bring out a few essential features thereof, viz.:—That up to a certain point, Brahmoism is the natural,

spontaneous growth of the nobler Hindu mind ; (2) that beyond that first growth, it demands an amount of resistance to established evils, entailing sacrifices from which many shrink back ; but (3) that where individual moral principle has stood firm through the transition period, it has usually been accompanied by a power to recast the conditions of social and religious life in accordance with a high Brahmic ideal which affords a most hopeful prospect for the future of Indian Theism. Whether that ideal contains all the elements essential to permanency, or whether it will be seriously modified by either of the great religions which now surround it, is a question too vast to discuss here. But of this we may rest assured, that the men who have done so much to develop a National Church are not likely to relinquish it for anything less noble than itself. We who are Christians believe that there is a completer Church still ; but if we are right, there is no cause for impatience ; all true paths lead to the City of God. May we not be found unworthy to meet there those pure-hearted and faithful men who are giving their lives to build up the Theistic Church of India.

SOPHIA DOBSON COLLET.

THE NAMES OF THE FIRST THREE KINGS OF ISRAEL.

NOTHING in Jewish history seems at first sight to be more certain than that the first three kings of Israel were named Saul, David and Solomon. And yet the Bible itself states explicitly that the official name given to the last by the prophet Nathan was not Solomon but Jedidiah (2 Samuel xii. 24, 25), and Böttcher has long ago suggested on the strength of 2 Samuel xxi. 19, 22, that the real name of David was El-hanan.

The doubt whether the names by which these kings are known to us were not really popular designations, or "nick-names," is strengthened when we come to examine into their history and use. The doubt extends also to the name of the first king, though no passage exists, as in the case of David and Solomon, from which we might infer that he had another name than Saul. But the name Saul, when taken in connection with the circumstances that led to the foundation of the Israelitish monarchy, gives rise to suspicions.

No one can fail to be struck by the singular appropriateness of the names of the first three kings of Israel to the traditional history and character of the persons by whom they were borne. Saul means "the demanded one," and he was chosen king in consequence of the demand of the Israelites that they should have a leader to deliver them from the yoke of the Philistines. The capture of the ark, and the death of Eli and his sons, had shattered the ancient power of the priesthood of Shiloh. Samuel seems to have had no military capacities, and the Philistines had not only planted garrisons in the heart of the Israelitish country but had even extirpated the iron-smiths for which Canaan

had been famous since the days of the Egyptian Mohar, in the age of Ramses II. At the same time, the Ammonites were harrying the towns on the eastern border, Canaanite fortresses maintained their independence in the midst, the Israelitish tribes were still without union or organisation, and their very existence was being threatened. No wonder therefore that the reluctant Samuel was forced to yield to the demand of his countrymen and Saul, the leader that "was asked for," was given to them. The name, it is true, was borne by other persons in the Old Testament. One of the sons of Simeon was called Saul (Genesis, xlv. 10; Numbers xxvi. 13); so also was a king of Edom (Genesis, xxxvi. 37). But this does not make the name as applied to the first Israelitish king the less appropriate or suspicious.

The case is still stronger when we come to the name of David. This is a name which is borne by no one else in ancient Jewish history. In place of it we find only Dodo or Dodai (Judges x. 1; 2 Samuel xxiii. 9, 24; 1 Chronicles xi. 26), "the beloved of the Lord," for which the full Dodavahu, transcribed Dodavah in the A.V., occurs in 2 Chronicles xx. 37. In fact, David, "the beloved one," was not a personal name at all. It was a divine title, applied to the youthful Sun-god who was worshipped under the manifold names of Tammuz, Adonai (Adonis), Hadad, and the like, and by the side of whom stood his female double and reflection Dido. Now, as is well known, the name of Dido, the title of the patron-goddess of Carthage, came in course of time to be transferred to Elissa, the Tyrian foundress of the city, and Dido and her sister Anna or "Grace," the Hebrew Hannah, were rationalised into personages of history. It is difficult not to conjecture that the same transference took place also among the Israelites, and that the familiar title of the Deity was given by his followers and people to the "beloved" founder of the Hebrew empire. What happened in Carthage may easily have happened elsewhere.

If, however, this conjecture is to be verified, we must show that the title of "the beloved" was one actually and

familiarly applied to the God of the Hebrews. And this, I think, can be done. In Isaiah v. 1, the prophet speaks of God as "my beloved," (*Dôd-i*, or, as it might be punctuated, *David-i*). Elsewhere the term seems to be avoided on account of the idolatrous associations with which it was connected, but it was used here by Isaiah with a special purpose. His "beloved" had a vineyard "in a very fruitful hill," in the midst whereof was a tower, and that vineyard was "the house of Israel," while its tower was the city of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was built on the hill or "horn" of Zion, where was the seat of "the house of David," and where too was the "city of David." Now, I am inclined to believe that the term "city of David," did not originally signify "the city which David captured,"—a signification for which I can find no real parallel*—but the city of the God who was worshipped on the spot, and whose title, "the beloved one," had become a sort of proper name. It was out of the city of David that the ark was removed into Solomon's temple, and the city of David is explained to be Zion (1 Kings viii. 1). Zion, it will be remembered, was "the city of the great King," (Psalm xlviii. 2), "the mount of Zion" which God "loved" (Psalm lxxviii. 68). No doubt, "the city of David" came subsequently to mean the city which David had conquered and made his capital, but I question whether this meaning was older than the time when the original name of David himself had been supplanted by the popular title of "the beloved."

We are supplied with plenty of information as to the origin of this nickname. David was a favourite with those about him from the beginning of his career. He had popular manners, was eloquent (1 Samuel xvi. 18), and brave, a good player on the harp, and above all red-haired and "of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to." He "found favour" with Saul at first (1 Samuel xvi. 22); Jonathan "loved him as he loved his own soul" (1 Samuel xx. 17), and "all Israel and Judah loved him"

* Of course a case like 2 Samuel xii. 23 is not in point.

(1 Samuel xviii. 16). He was the idol of the outlaws and desperadoes whom he gathered round him in the cave of Adullam, and though the wars and tyranny of the latter part of his reign caused discontent which broke out in two rebellions, this was all forgotten after his death, and the memory of the people dwelt fondly upon the king who had made his way to the throne "from the sheep-cote." In his predecessor, the prophetic annalists had seen the punishment of the refusal of the people to submit any longer to the rule of Samuel and the priests; the people had demanded a king and he that had been "demanded" had led them only to death and disaster. In his successor a future age saw the impersonation of a time of peace and prosperity only too much contradicted by the actual facts; David alone was the popular hero—not born in the purple, like Solomon, not a mere military captain, whose name was associated with national disaster, like Saul. David was emphatically the "beloved" king of Israel, and it was not surprising, therefore, if he received the title which the Deity had received before him from the affection of his worshippers. The woman of Tekoah declared that he was "as the angel of God" (2 Samuel xiv. 17).

A later generation found yet another reason for the name which had been given to David. Already Samuel had said that he was "a man after God's own heart" (1 Samuel xiii. 14; Acts xiii. 22), and he was regarded by his contemporaries as beloved by God as well as by man. No other explanation could be given of his marvellous rise and success in life.

If, therefore, no passage existed which implied that David was not the king of Israel's original name, we should still be justified in holding that such was the case. But, as Böttcher has pointed out, the only natural interpretation of 2 Samuel xxi. 19, is that the king's real name was El-hanan. Here we are told that in a battle at Gob—a place not otherwise mentioned—El-hanan, the son of Jaare-oregim, a Bethlehemite, slew Goliath, the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam. We know from the first

book of Samuel that the slayer of Goliath was really David, the Bethlehemite; and that it was David who is intended here is expressly stated at the end of the fragment (v. 22), where it is said that "these four—that is, Ishbi-benob, Saph, Goliath, and the un-named Gittite, with twenty-four fingers and toes—were born to the giant in Gath, and fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants." As David's "servants" were Abishai, Sibbechai, and Jonathan, David himself must be El-hanan, the slayer of Goliath.

The name, Jaare-oregim, given to El-hanan's father, is corrupt. It appears as Ya'ûr in the corresponding passage of the Chronicles (1 Chronicles xx. 5), which is read Ya'îr in the Keri, and the word *oregim*, "weavers," has clearly come from the following line, where it occurs in the phrase מִנֵּר אֶרְנִיב, "a weaver's beam." The eye of the copyist must have mistaken the last two letters of *m'nûr* for those of Ya'ûr, which shows that the alteration of Ya'ûr into Ya'arê, "woods," was a consequence of the introduction of '*orégim* into the text. Ya'arê itself is written, according to the Keri, with a small *resh*, which, however, looks more like a *waw*, and the Keri Ya'îr in the Chronicles seems to imply that there was originally a *yod* in the word. As it stands, however, the name is hopelessly corrupt, and the only thing about it of which we can be certain is that it began with a *yod*. So, also, does the name of Jesse, the father of David, which wants only one letter to make it as long as Ya'ûr.

The arguments brought against Böttcher's view, by Thenius and others, are none of them of much weight. The principal objection is, that the deaths of the four Philistine giants must be in chronological order, and all belong to the period after David's accession to the throne. But, as every one knows who has studied the historical books of the Old Testament, the position of a narrative is no indication of its right chronological place; the compiler, in arranging his materials, never scruples to subordinate chronological to other considerations. How little confidence can be placed in the chronological arrangement of the history may be judged of from 1 Samuel xvii. 54, where it is said that

David brought the head of Goliath to Jerusalem, which was not taken by him until after the death of Ishbosheth. As a matter of fact, the whole of the fragment which describes the overthrow of the Philistine giants is misplaced chronologically, since the Philistines were subdued at the very beginning of David's reign, shortly after the murder of Ishbosheth (2 Samuel v. 17, viii. 1), Gath more especially being reduced to servitude (1 Chronicles xviii. 1). We cannot even be certain that the events themselves recorded in the fragment are in strict chronological order. At any rate, there cannot have been more than one Goliath, a giant of Gath, "the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam," and the destruction of him is here ascribed, not to David, but to El-hanan, who must, therefore, be identical with David himself.

The name of El-hanan occurs again in another fragment, which gives a list of "the mighty men" of David (2 Samuel xxiii. 24). Here he is called "the son of Dodo, of Bethlehem," though elsewhere (2 Samuel xxiii. 9) Dodo is termed an Ahohite, and his son is called Eleazar. Now I cannot help thinking that there is a confusion here between "El-hanan, who is Dodo (David) of Bethlehem," and "Eleazar the son of Dodo, the Ahohite." Dodo is a contracted form of Doda-vahu, "Beloved of the Lord," but it may also be an archaic spelling of David (Dod) with the termination of the nominative.

It is even possible that the relationship that existed in the mind of the Phoenicians between Anna and Dido may have existed also in some form or other among the Israelites of the age of David, and have had its influence in determining the "nickname" by which El-hanan should be known. However this may be, it is a curious fact that the three last kings of Edom, whose names are recounted in Genesis xxxvi., were Saul, Baal-hanan, and Hadar, who has been conjectured to be the Hadad of 1 Kings, xi. 14—22, the deliverer of Edom from the Israelitish yoke after the death of David. In Baal-hanan, "Baal has mercy," Baal takes the place of El, as elsewhere.

As I have already said, we learn from Samuel xii. 24 that the proper name of Solomon was Jedidiah, "the beloved of the Lord," which reminds us again of *David*. Solomon was merely the popular name of the prince—"his name was called Solomon," as it ought to be translated, the verb being impersonal—whereas the name given through Nathan, by the Lord himself, because He "loved him," was Jedidiah. Solomon (Sh'lomoh) "the peaceful" is a name which in this precise form is not borne by any other Old Testament character, though we find Sh'lomi, which varies but slightly from it, in Numbers xxxiv. 27, and Sh'lomith, as well as the compound Sh'lumi'el, and Shelem-yahu (Shelemiah). But a Solomon (Salamanu), king of Moab, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser II. (B.C. 732; see Hos. x. 14), and Solomon (Sallimmanu) was also the name of an Assyrian divinity. It may, therefore, like David, have been a title of the Deity among the Phœnicians and Israelites, and on that account, also like David, not have been used as a personal name. Whether this were so or not, however, we have the authority of the Biblical writer himself for maintaining that the name of Solomon was a nickname, and not the true name of the king. After times looked back upon the reign of Solomon as a golden age of peace, and though the account preserved in 1 Kings xi. shows that this was not the case, nevertheless the period of aggressive warfare was past. Just as in Roman legend Romulus was followed by Numa Pompilius, so the warrior hero of Israel was succeeded by his unwarlike son. I need hardly add that the fact that Solomon was a nickname lends increased probability to my contention that Saul and David were nicknames too.

A point which arises out of the one I have been discussing is the length of the reigns of the three kings, whom we must still continue to call Saul, David, and Solomon. The length of David's reign may be regarded as fixed by 2 Samuel v. 5, (cp. 2 Samuel ii. 11, and 1 Kings ii. 11), and is borne out by his great age at the time of his death; but the forty years assigned to Saul and Solomon is merely the number which

expresses in the Bible, as well as on the Moabite Stone, an unknown and indefinite space of time. The forty years of 2 Samuel xv. 7, really represented little more than two (see 2 Samuel xiv. 28; Absalom had previously been in exile for three years, 2 Samuel xiii. 38); so that we need not suppose that the expression necessarily implies a period of any considerable length. Various reasons go to show that Saul's reign could not have lasted more than four or five years. Already in his second year Samuel declared that his kingdom should "not continue; the Lord hath sought him a man after His own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over His people" (1 Samuel xiii. 14). The flight of David can hardly have happened more than a year afterwards, especially when we remember that he had not been married long enough to Michal to have any children by her, and the time spent by Saul in hunting him down could have been at most only a few months. After this he resided at the court of Achish of Gath a year and four months (1 Samuel xxvii. 7), at the end of which time the battle of Gilboa and the death of Saul took place. The length of Saul's reign, therefore, may be approximately placed at five years, though this is probably slightly over the mark. According to Eupolemos (Alex. Polyh. *Frg.* 18 ed. Müller) Saul reigned 21 years; according to Josephos, 20 (Antiq. 6, 14, 9. 10, 8, 4). Twenty is merely the half of the indefinite number forty, and the 21 of Eupolemos is due to adding to this the date contained in 1 Samuel xiii. 1.

For the length of Solomon's reign we have mainly to depend on 1 Kings xi. The temple was finished in his eleventh year (1 Kings vi. 38), and his own palace in his thirteenth or fourteenth year (1 Kings vii. 1, comp. iii. 1). At the same time, or immediately afterwards, he strengthened the Millo or rampart (1 Kings iii. 1, ix. 24), and it was while he was engaged in this work that Jeroboam was forced to fly from his jealousy into Egypt (1 Kings xi. 27). After his death Jeroboam returned, excited the Ten Tribes to revolt, and

ruled over them for twenty-two years (1 Kings xiv. 20). As, at the time of his flight, he was old enough to be made "ruler over all the charge of the house of Joseph," it is difficult to believe that he could have been more than ten years in exile, when we consider the comparatively short reigns of most of the other Israelitish and Jewish kings.* He fled, we learn, to the court of Shishak I. (1 Kings xi. 40), who reigned twenty-one years, and captured Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 25). Supposing this campaign took place as late as Shishak's twentieth year, which is not very probable, and that he had been no more than one year on the throne when Jeroboam came to him, Jeroboam's exile would have lasted fourteen years. At the very beginning of Solomon's reign, moreover, just after the death of David and Joab, Hadad and Rezon stripped the Jewish sovereign of his possessions in Edom and Syria, and we are told of Rezon that "he was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon, beside the mischief Hadad did" (1 Kings xi. 25.) It is not likely that two contemporary Oriental kings should each have reigned and have carried on war with one another for a considerable number of years. Hiram, again, was still governing Tyre in the twentieth year of Solomon's reign according to 1 Kings ix. 10, 11, and Menander, as quoted by Josephos, made the length of Hiram's reign thirty-four years. Now, according to 2 Samuel v. 11, Hiram had sent architects to David shortly after his capture of Jerusalem, at the beginning of his reign, before Solomon was born (see 2 Samuel vii. 1), though, it is true, this is inconsistent with the statement of Josephos that the fourth year of Solomon was the 12th of Hiram. On the other hand, the Phœnician historian, Menander, made 143 years and 8 months elapse from the date of the building of Solomon's temple to that of

* The kings of Judah, who came after Solomon, lived to the following ages:—Rehoboam, 18 \times x years; Jehoshaphat, 60; Jehoram, 40; Ahaziah, 23; Jehoash, 47; Amaziah, 54; Uzziah, 68; Jotham, 41; Abaz, 36; Hezekiah, 54; Manasseh, 67; Amon, 24; Josiah, 39; Jehoiakim, 36.

the foundation of Carthage, which is variously given as B.C. 846, 826 and 816. The last date would fix the accession of Solomon at 963 B.C.

The number of twenty years given in 1 Kings ix. 10, as that within which the great buildings of Solomon were completed, cannot be pressed, partly because it is merely the half of the indefinite forty, partly because it is inconsistent with the precise number of thirteen years given in 1 Kings vii. 1. Solomon must have begun the erection of his palace very shortly after his accession, since it was already commenced when he married the daughter of the Egyptian Pharaoh (1 Kings iii. 1). A comparison of 1 Kings iii. 1, with ix. 24, shows that the house which he made "for Pharaoh's daughter" (vii. 8) was a portion of the palace. The enlargement of the Millo, or rampart, and the wall of Jerusalem (1 Kings ix. 15, 24), probably took place before the completion of the royal palace. This, at least, would be the usual signification of the Hebrew *az* "then" (in ix. 24), and one of the king's first objects would naturally be the strengthening of his capital. Moreover, the enlargement of the city walls seems to have formed part of the architectural plan of the palace. In any case, however, the Millo cannot well have been finished later than the fifteenth year of Solomon's reign. By this time Jeroboam had already escaped to Shishak, the founder of the twenty-second Egyptian dynasty, who was now engaged in overcoming the rival dynasty of Tanis, and would, therefore, welcome the enemy of a prince who was connected by marriage with his antagonists. As Shishak's reign lasted only twenty-one years, and his capture of Jerusalem took place in the fifth year of Rehoboam, Jeroboam could not have been with him more than fifteen years at the most, or Solomon have reigned more than thirty-four. In order, however, to make Solomon's reign last so long, we must assume that Jeroboam did not leave Jerusalem till his nineteenth year, that the fugitive arrived at Bubastis in the first year of Shishak, and that Shishak's campaign against Judah was made only the year before his death. All these assumptions

are improbable. We have seen that Jeroboam's flight can hardly have happened so late as the nineteenth year of Solomon's reign, while he is not likely to have sought refuge with a prince who was but just beginning to establish his power, and might at any moment be crushed by his Tanite rivals. That the Jewish campaign took place at an earlier date than the year before Shishak's death is almost certain. In his twenty-first and last year he completed the building of a small temple, whose ruins are still admired by travellers at Karnak, and it must have been before this was begun that the southern wall of the great hall of Karnak was adorned with the names of the conquered Israelitish towns. It is probable, therefore, that the real length of Solomon's reign was more like twenty-five years than thirty-four.

No objection can be raised against this conclusion on the ground of the statement in 1 Kings xiv. 21, that Rehoboam was forty and one years old at the time of his accession. This merely denotes the indefinite number of years of Solomon's reign added to one, and means that Rehoboam was born before Solomon came to the throne. Hence it was that Solomon's successor was not a son of the Egyptian princess, but of Naamah, the Ammonitess. There had already been a close connection between David and the royal family of Ammon, due, as Professor Robertson Smith has shown, to the fact that the totem of the serpent (Nahash) was common to the two families. When the capital of Ammon was captured by Joab, the royal crown was carefully preserved, and placed over David's head.

It is now possible to give approximate dates for the reigns of the three first kings of Israel. Thanks to the decipherment of the Assyrian inscriptions, the chronology of the Books of Kings, which has so long been the despair of chronologists, has at last been rectified, and proved to be more than forty years in excess. For the earlier portion of the history we now have a fixed date in the death of Ahab, B.C. 852, two years after the battle of Karkar. We may, therefore, place the death of Solomon in B.C. 937. If we reckon his reign at thirty years, which is probably over the

mark, the death of David will fall in B.C. 967, and his accession in B.C. 1007. It was precisely at this period that the empires of Egypt and Assyria were both alike in a condition of weakness and decline, the only power in Western Asia at all able to treat with the rising kingdom of David on equal terms being that of the newly-discovered people of the Hittites.

A. H. SAYCE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

DR. EDERSHEIM'S LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS.*

ON receiving two more great volumes upon the Life of Christ, our first feeling was one of thankfulness that the evangelists did not live in the nineteenth century: then would the simplicity of our impression have been lost behind a multitude of trivialities affecting the outward man, and a Gospel of the spirit would have been impossible. However, there are those who like to see the Christ arrayed in a purple robe of rhetoric, and think there is no irreverence in filling up the imperfect portraiture of his external life with conjectural details; and all must welcome an account of the times in which he lived, enriched, as it is in Dr. Edersheim's volumes, with ample stores of Rabbinic and other learning, skilfully arranged, and presented in an attractive style. The historical framework which is erected around the narratives of the New Testament, and adorned with that wealth of knowledge and illustration which the writer's minute acquaintance with Rabbinical literature supplies, seems to us to constitute the great, and probably permanent, value of this most recent attempt to translate the Gospels into modern and western language. We are taken back into the ancient scenes of Jewish activity, till we feel as if we had wandered among "the dispersion" of Babylonia, strayed into the Synagogues of the Hellenists, and walked about Jerusalem, surveying the services of its Temple, and mixing with the "noisy sellers and bargaining buyers" of its bazaars and markets. We enter with a new vividness into the hopes, the merits, and the defects of Judaism, and see with fresh clearness the underlying principles of its various religious and political parties. The following sketch of the Rabbis (balanced, however, by other and fuller accounts), and of the relation between the natural and historical features of Judæa and the Rabbinical character, may serve to illustrate the author's style, and may probably remind our readers of some professing Christians whom it may have been their misfortune to encounter, and whose spiritual resemblance to the

* *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.* By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A. Oxon., D.D., Ph. D., Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn. In two volumes. London: Longmans, 1883.

Rabbis must be due to some deeper cause than the influence of scenery:—

In Judæa all seemed to invite to retrospection and introspection; to favour habits of solitary thought and study, till it kindled into fanaticism. Mile by mile as you travelled southwards, memories of the past would crowd around, and thoughts of the future would rise within. Avoiding the great towns as the centres of hated heathenism, the traveller would meet few foreigners, but everywhere encounter those gaunt representatives of what was regarded as the superlative excellency of his religion. These were the embodiment of Jewish piety and asceticism, the possessors and expounders of the mysteries of his faith, the fountain-head of wisdom, who were not only sure of heaven themselves, but knew its secrets, and were its very aristocracy; men who could tell him all about his own religion, practised its most minute injunctions, and could interpret every stroke and letter of the Law—nay, whose it actually was to “loose and to bind,” to pronounce an action lawful or unlawful, and to “remit or retain sins,” by declaring a man liable to, or free from, expiatory sacrifices, or else punishment in this or the next world. . . . And all around, even nature itself might seem to foster such tendencies. Even at that time Judæa was comparatively desolate, barren, grey. The decaying cities of ancient renown; the lone highland scenery; the bare, rugged hills; the rocky terraces from which only artificial culture could woo a return; the wide solitary plains, deep glens, limestone heights—with distant glorious Jerusalem ever in the far background, would all favour solitary thought and religious abstraction.*

In his description of the Jewish world Dr. Edersheim is not always equally satisfactory. His reliance upon the fragments ascribed to Aristobolus, and his belief, on their authority, in the existence of “very early Greek versions of at least parts of the Pentateuch,”† are open to serious question, Valkenaer notwithstanding. His sketch of the Alexandrian philosophy, necessarily very brief, hardly does justice to Philo’s position in the world of thought, and some statements are dogmatically made which are not universally accepted by interpreters of Philo. In his account of the Messianic idea he seems to be under the influence of two tendencies. In accordance with his prevailing view (in which we entirely concur) that Christianity cannot be explained as a mere outgrowth of Judaism, he says that Jesus “was not the Messiah of Jewish conception,”‡ and yet afterwards he seems as if he had a grievance against those who carry that opinion too far, and declares that the Jews “appear to have regarded the Messiah as far above the ordinary human, royal, prophetic, and even Angelic type, to such extent, that the boundary-line separating it from Divine Personality is of the narrowest.”§ It is impossible in the space at our disposal to examine this view; but the arguments adduced in its favour will not prove universally convincing. That the Jews expected the Messiah to be “elevated above the ordinary conditions of humanity” no one, probably, will dispute; but it seems strange to appeal, in proof of their belief in his premundane existence, to a passage which refers also to the premundane existence of the Thorah, Israel, and the Temple, and which therefore suggests an order, not in time, but in the Divine thought; and if it is said that he would be “loftier

* Vol. I. pp. 223 sq. † Vol. I. p. 24. ‡ Vol. I. p. 164. § Vol. I. p. 171.

than the ministering Angels"* (the italics are Dr. Edersheim's), it ought to be remembered that the Jews also looked back to "a time when all Israel were not only free from death, but like the Angels, and even higher than they."† When we allow for Oriental language, and consider actual instances of its use, we must regard such passages as proving only that the Messiah was expected to be the impersonation of Israel's ideal.

If we pass to a consideration of the critical value of the work, we can only say a few words as to the principles on which it is based. The problem to be solved is justly conceived, and the statement of it at once excites the sympathetic attention of the reader. Dr. Edersheim says in his Preface :—

I wish to disclaim having taken any predetermined dogmatic standpoint at the outset of my investigations. I wish to write, not for a definite purpose, be it even that of the defence of the faith—but rather to let that purpose grow out of the book, as would be pointed out by the course of independent study, in which arguments on both sides should be impartially weighed and facts ascertained. In this manner I hoped best to attain what must be the first object in all research, but especially in such as the present : to ascertain, so far as we can, the truth, irrespective of consequences. And thus also I hoped to help others, by going, as it were, before them, in the path which their inquiries must take, and removing the difficulties and entanglements which beset it.

Nevertheless we fear that those who are really conscious of difficulties will feel them all the more keenly after the perusal of the pages which are intended to allay them. For Dr. Edersheim hardly estimates correctly the present nature of the problem or the argument on which he mainly relies. The mythical theory of Strauss, to which he principally addresses himself, fails to represent the position of many who are unable to follow our author's rigid literalism. There is a growing number of those who are constrained to reject several details in the Gospel narratives, but are very far from wishing to appear as opponents of Christianity. They gladly accept the Gospels as substantially historical, and profoundly reverence their revelation of a unique spirit, or, if Dr. Edersheim would prefer the phrase, of a Divine humanity, and nevertheless recognise in them a commingling of unhistorical material. Such persons will feel the strange incongruity of the literal appearance of Angels, and the literal singing of Angelic hosts in the sky, more deeply than ever when they have just gone through a realistic description of Jerusalem, and are forced to ask themselves what they would think of it if some shepherds came and said that an Angel had talked to them on one of our English hills. The difficulty of accounting for the origin of stories of that kind does not in the least remove the difficulty of believing them. Of the latter difficulty Dr. Edersheim seems quite unconscious ; and we may say generally that he fails to appreciate the actual weight of difficulty in the minds of those from whose opinion he dissents, and consequently his arguments glance off at one side, and make not the slightest impression.

* P. 177.

† P. 166.

Even as regards the extreme theory of Strauss himself the main argument of the book seems quite inconclusive. To prove "that Jesus Christ was, alike in the fundamental direction of His teaching and work, and in its details, antithetic to the Synagogue in its doctrine, practice, and expectancies,"* only shows that the Gospels were not the offspring of the Synagogue. But Strauss does not maintain that they were. The Messianic expectation is only one of his two sources of Evangelical myths; the other is, in Strauss's own words, "the particular impression which Jesus left by reason of his personal qualities, his action, and his fate, by which he modified the idea which his countrymen formed to themselves of the Messiah." To show, therefore, that a narrative cannot have sprung out of the known views and expectations of Judaism has no tendency to prove that it is not a *Christian* myth. The theory of Strauss must be refuted upon other grounds.

Notwithstanding Dr. Edersheim's rigid adherence to the literal accuracy of the Gospels, he is obliged to admit the presence of small errors, because the parallel accounts do not always agree. Of his mode of dealing with these errors two examples may be given. In the narrative of the temptation, which is accepted as matter-of-fact history, in which Jesus was really carried to Jerusalem by the spirit of the Devil, "St. Matthew places the Temple-temptation before that of the world-kingdom, while St. Luke inverts this order, probably because his narrative was primarily intended for Gentile readers, to whose mind this might present itself as to them the true gradation of temptation."† This means, in plain English, that Luke deliberately falsified known history, of the most solemn and momentous kind, in order to suit the prejudices of his readers. It is fortunate that this suggestion was not made by "opponents of Christianity." While referring to the temptation we may observe that rationalism also is not altogether inadmissible: "no rational interpretation would insist on the absolute literality" of the statement about the mountain from which all the kingdoms of the world were seen. The mountain was real, but not the view; Jesus saw enough to suggest the rest.‡ This almost deserves a note of admiration, of which Dr. Edersheim is fond when alluding to the opinions of other scholars. A second example of our author's treatment of error may be taken from his account of the healing of the blind man or blind men at Jericho: "In regard to the . . . divergence, trifling as it is, that St. Luke places the incident at the arrival, the other two Evangelists at the departure of Jesus from Jericho, it is better to admit our inability to conciliate these differing notes of time, than to make clumsy attempts at harmonising them. We can readily believe that there may have been circumstances unknown to us, which might show these statements to be not really diverging."§ We cannot share the author's readiness of belief; but it in no way lowers our respect for the Evangelists to suppose that, like other historians, they were sometimes inaccurate.

Space forbids us to enter into any discussion of Dr. Edersheim's

* Preface, p. xiii † Vol. I. p. 299. ‡ Vol. I. p. 296. § Vol. II. p. 355.

theological position. Suffice it to say that Jesus is with him "the God-Man," and that the two elements of his being which are indicated by that very unscriptural term are so presented as to make it exceedingly difficult to blend them into any self-consistent picture. Here too the work will be more convincing to those who are already convinced than to those who occupy a different theological field. But though we cannot accept our author's principal theories, we desire to part from him with a warm expression of our thanks for such a learned and interesting work. Our own sympathies are wholly on the side of a constructive theology, and we never object to seeing the critics criticised; but we cannot believe that modern research and modern methods have been altogether nugatory, and we fear that exorbitant claims will only-repel from Christianity many whom it would be desirable to attract. However, each man must be faithful to his own best light, and we probably diverge from one another far more in the letter than in the spirit.

J. D.

MR. GROUND ON MR. HERBERT SPENCER'S PHILOSOPHY.

MR. GROUND'S "Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy," * to which is appended a list of several hundred subscribers, including an archbishop, about a dozen bishops, and a host of clergymen, is a book of some significance as indicating the probable future attitude of the more reflective portion of orthodox Christianity towards the doctrine of Evolution. It evinces a fair acquaintance with Mr. Spencer's system of philosophy, and no small amount of logical and rhetorical power, but it is greatly disfigured by the writer's inordinate conceit, which renders him blind to the fact that his book is, in the main, only a popular presentation of views and criticisms which have already found more accurate and classical expression in the writings of Dr. Martineau, Dr. Ward, Professor Mivart, Dr. Elam, and others. The author is quite alive to the anti-theistic influence of recent speculation, and utters the prediction that "if the present state of thought in the higher intellectual ranges is allowed to continue in our nation for twenty years longer, the bulk of the largest and strongest intellects will have thrown off the Theistic faith." Nor does he think that the preachers are likely to prove equal to this serious emergency.

Occasionally (he says), when listening to some of the ablest preachers of Christendom, I have clothed myself for a time in the armour of an Agnostic, and considered what such a one would say to the preacher's arguments, and how he would outflank the preacher's greatest statements by a larger generalisation. The conclusion I reach is, that at present there is no prominent divine throughout Christendom who has yet shown himself to possess that calibre, grasp, extent, and accuracy of information, which are needed to fashion a bolt that would pierce such an Agnostic's armour.

* *An Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy*: Intended as a Proof that Theism is the only Theory of the Universe that can satisfy Reason. By the Rev. W. D. GROUND, Curate of Newburn, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1888.

The "at present" must refer to a date previous to the publication of Mr. Ground's book, for the reading of a few pages of that work will render it evident that the author of it no longer feels the slightest doubt that the dexterous David whose logical shafts are destined to floor the agnostic Goliath has at length entered the lists. Mr. Ground thinks that he has shown "that Dr. Martineau, who was purposely selected as distinctly the most formidable antagonist Christendom had sent against Mr. Spencer, is incompetent for such a task." The only basis alleged for this charge of incompetency is that Dr. Martineau, in his essay on "Modern Materialism," argues that the Evolutionist, in order to account for the evolution of the cosmos, must assume for his primitive atoms specific differences of constitution and collocation; whereas, argues Mr. Ground, he ought to have remembered that "the very essence of Mr. Spencer's system—that which differentiates it—is that it is the deduction of the world as we know it out of first principles. 'Give me Force and its Persistence,' says Mr. Spencer, 'and I will build up your universe even to the highest intellectual range.' That is the position which must be met, and I submit that Dr. Martineau has not met it." Mr. Ground himself forgets that what Dr. Martineau was dealing with was not the empty pretension that the cosmos can be deduced from indeterminate homogeneous atoms, *plus* the principle of the Persistence of Force, but with the actual mode of deduction as expounded by Evolutionists; and his position is that the "Evolutionist must, in spite of his contempt for final causes, himself proceed upon a preconceived world-plan, and guide his own intellect as, step by step, he fits it to the universe, by the very process which he declares to be absent from the universe itself." In this contention Dr. Martineau is in entire agreement with the conclusion reached by an eminent thinker, who was equally at home in science and in philosophy, the late Professor Jevons, who says in his *Principles of Science*, in reference to the evolution theory:—

Every atom which existed in any point of space must have existed there previously, or must have been created there by a previously existing Power. When placed there it must have had a definite mass and a definite energy, kinetic or potential as regards other existing atoms. Now, as before remarked, an unlimited number of atoms can be placed in unlimited space in an entirely unlimited number of modes of distribution. Out of infinitely infinite choices which were open to the Creator, *that one choice must have been made which has yielded the universe as it now exists.*

It is the more surprising that Mr. Ground should have seen any incompetency in this, because, as the reader soon discovers, Mr. Ground himself holds a view that is not logically distinguishable from the above. His main object is to combine agreement with Mr. Spencer's doctrine, that the original homogeneity of substance and the persistence of force will explain everything, with a belief in an intelligent and moral Creator in the place of Mr. Spencer's "Unknowable." He seems satisfied that he has succeeded, but we think it will be clear to most readers of his book that his Theism is only established at the cost of surrendering nearly all that

Mr. Spencer thinks most distinctive and original in his philosophical system.

The ablest and most instructive part of the volume is the earlier half, in which the writer carefully analyses the *First Principles* and the *Principles of Psychology*, and shows that it is a fundamental principle in Mr. Spencer's philosophy that Matter and Mind are so intrinsically different that the transformation of one into the other is utterly inconceivable. That being the case, Mr. Ground justly argues that Mind must be inherent in the ultimate unity out of which the physical and mental cosmos proceeds, and that therefore as there is intelligence in the Cause of the universe, that Cause cannot justly be said to be Unknowable. He maintains that the infinity of the Divine Intellect does not render God absolutely unknowable, but simply unknowable in His entirety, and he does not seem to be aware that Dr. Martineau, in his articles on "Science, Nescience, and Faith," and on "Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought," has already shown in a far more clear and conclusive way that God may be "apprehended," though He cannot be "comprehended."

This book deserves credit for the vivid picture it gives of the inconsistencies which cling to Mr. Spencer's account of "Mind." In the first place, as Mr. Ground shows, he often represents consciousness as though it were only another mode of the correlated forces of heat, electricity, vitality, &c., though he has previously emphatically declared that it has no predicate in common with physical forces. There is, no doubt, an inconsistency in Mr. Spencer's teaching on this point, but Mr. Ground does not, we think, point out that Mr. Spencer indicates his own way of escape from the dilemma by the doctrine that the elementary factors of mind are probably only the mental aspect of the same substance of which the molecules of the cerebral structure are the other aspect. But even if we admit this theory, Mr. Spencer falls into another self-contradiction, for he teaches in one portion of his writings that "it is an illusion to suppose that at each moment the *ego* is something more than the aggregate of feelings and ideas, actual and nascent, which then exist," while in another passage he says, "the subject" (which must mean the *ego*) "is the unknown permanent *nexus* which continues to exist amid transitory ideas."

Mr. Spencer does not show how it is possible for this *permanent subject* to be fashioned out of the psychical stocks which constitute, in his view, the elements of Mind. Mr. Ground then discusses Free-will, which he accepts on the evidence of consciousness, and shows that Mr. Spencer's objections to it are rather unverified assertions than demonstrations. But Free-will cannot be evolved out of Necessity; so here, at all events, we have a decided breach of that boasted principle of continuity which is the essential feature of Spencerian evolution. We find, too, that in the evolution of rational self-consciousness out of animal sensation, and in the birth and progress of the moral sentiments, Mr. Ground virtually admits that we must recognise a fresh impulsion—a divine *vis*—to enable man to make these higher departures. He goes even further

than this, and contends for the reality of the Biblical miracles, and declares that Christ, "as a sinless man, introduced a factor never before known." He may be right in these views, but if so, it is evident that the main principle of Mr. Spencer's doctrine is utterly discredited, for it is only in so far as Mr. Spencer succeeds in explaining the later chapters in the book of evolution by the earlier that he attains the end that he has in view, and his conversion to Mr. Ground's Theism, with its successive phases of divine activity and its teleological principle of development, would not be, as Mr. Ground seems to think it would, a mere substitution of the Christian's for the Agnostic's Deity; it would virtually be the entire collapse of his whole system of thought, and a return to the old theological doctrine in a slightly modified form.

Mr. Ground's book is in many respects a sound and popularly-written critique of Mr. Spencer's main positions, but both his extravagant notion of his own importance and his extravagant laudation of Mr. Spencer's principle of continuity are sadly out of place; and if he would be content to sit for awhile at the feet of some of those thinkers whom he calls incompetent, he would better understand the true relation of Spencerian Evolution to Christian Theism.

C. B. U.

MR. ABBOTT'S TRANSLATION OF KANT'S ETHICAL WRITINGS.*

AMONG the numerous works on Kant and his philosophy which have issued from the English press during the last few years Mr. Abbott's is one of the most opportune and serviceable. Prof. Calderwood's edition of Mr. Semple's work already furnishes the English reader with a translation of the *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, also of the *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Sittenlehre*, and of a portion of the celebrated *Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft*. Mr. Abbott's translation contains the first two of these treatises and the whole of the last-mentioned work, as well as the first half (i.e., that pertaining to Ethics) of the treatise *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*. Thus the whole of the ethical views of Kant are now made as accessible to English-reading students by Mr. Abbott's translations as his views on the nature of knowledge are by the translations of Prof. Max Müller, Prof. Mahaffy, Prof. Meiklejohn, and Mr. Belfort Bax. We have compared Mr. Abbott's translations and also Mr. Semple's with the originals, and find that while they are both good translations Mr. Abbott's excels in closeness to the German, and is also, we think, rather more readily intelligible. This translation resembles the translation of the "Prolegomena" by Mr. Bax in that it is accompanied by an excellent memoir

* *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and other works on the Theory of Ethics*, translated by THOMAS KINGSMILL ABBOTT, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. Third Edition. Revised and enlarged. With memoir and portrait. London: Longmans and Co. 1883.

and a portrait. The portraits in the two books come from the same source. The respective memoirs give prominence to different aspects of Kant's life and writing, so that neither is superfluous; nor indeed should we like to be without the third competing Memoir, namely, that by Dr. Wallace, in "Blackwood's Philosophical Classics." Mr. Abbott appends to his Memoir a brief but suggestive sketch of Kant's position as an ethical philosopher, and of his relation to some other moralists. He mentions the interesting fact that though Kant was influenced in his moral discussions by English moralists, Butler, who wrote half a century before him, was wholly unknown to him. This Mr. Abbott attributes to the circumstance that Butler's ethical views were presented under the form of *Fifteen Sermons*, a title which would not be likely to attract a foreign student of Ethics. We are glad to see that Mr. Abbott's book has already reached a third edition, and we hope that it will still attract many readers, for the importation of some of Kant's leading ideas on Ethics into English moral philosophy would, we think, be of great service to the cause of truth and religion.

C. B. U.

MR. LILLIE'S POPULAR LIFE OF BUDDHA.*

THIS book is designed as a reply to the well-known expositions of Buddhism by Mr. T. W. Rhys Davids, and its title page announces that it contains an answer to the Hibbert Lectures of 1881. The writer professes the greatest admiration for the person of Gotama Buddha, and regards him as the author of one of the most important religious revolutions, if not the most important, which the world has ever seen. He finds the current accounts of the original significance of Buddhism, especially that with which Mr. Davids's name is associated, unsatisfactory, and he propounds another solution in their stead. The theory is, in brief, that the Buddhist movement was the revolt of the higher Brahmanism against the lower (p. 127). The historical Buddha is accordingly presented as a theist of the most exalted type, who attempted to bring down the Kingdom of the Sky to this dull earth. The writer has great sympathy with the moral drift of Buddhist teaching; he has a quick eye for the picturesque and a facile pen for retelling some of the charming stories with which the Buddhist books abound. But he is unable to grasp the real conditions of the problem; he only gets his results by recklessly reading his own views into the materials provided by independent scholars, and picking out whatever suits him from all kinds of Buddhism in different countries and at different times. For example, Foucaux's translation of the Tibetan version of the Lalitavistara contains the following passage—"Après des kalpas écoulés par centaines de millions de kôtis, les Bouddhas Bhagavats apparaissent quelquefois dans le monde." This of course refers to the familiar belief in recurring cycles of the world's history in which

* *The Popular Life of Buddha*; by ARTHUR LILLIE, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society. London: Kegan Paul, 1883.

unsuccessful Buddhas arise: the title *Bhagavat* means 'venerable' or 'blessed.' Mr. Lillie, however, chooses to render Foucaux's French thus — "The God Almighty Buddha (Buddha Bhagavat) only visits the world after many kalpas" (p. 15). Here Mr. Lillie has blended all the series into one permanent being, and then designated him out of his own head 'God Almighty.' In this way it is possible to prove anything, and it is not surprising, therefore, to find Mr. Lillie, who professes great respect for Mr. Rhys Davids's Pali scholarship (of which he is himself quite ignorant), correcting him about the gender of a word, in spite of the warning given him in a note on the very passage whose meaning he thus perverts. The question relates to the union with Brahman delineated in the *Tevijja Sutta*. Mr. Lillie will have it (p. 134) that this masculine Brahman must be the neuter Brahma, 'the formless, pure, pervading, eternal, passionless God,' because that would suit his theory, whereas the modern Brahman, with whom he is acquainted through the pages of Ward's antiquated *Religion of the Hindoos*, is a very objectionable personage. We hardly know which is the more foolish, to try to force on Mr. Rhys Davids a mistake against which he specially cautions the reader, or to assume that the gross anthropomorphisms of the latest and lowest forms of Hindu theology must be read back into the controversy of Gotama Buddha with the Brahmans. Other examples might easily be given to show how unsafe a guide is the writer of this book. He explains the origin of the doctrine of transmigration by the crude notion that "it was invented by the priesthood to account for the caste system" (p. 219); he declares it "certain that Buddha was the first to proclaim that duty was to be sought in the eternal principles of morality and justice, and not in animal sacrifices and local formalities invented by the fancy of priests" (p. vi.), as though Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and their successors had contributed nothing similar to the religious history of mankind before the year 470 B.C.; he finds in the statement of the Lotus of the Good Law that "at the moment of death thousands of Buddhas show their faces to the virtuous man" something "very like the 'discerning of spirits' recorded by St. Paul" (p. 83). Whatever there may be here and there of shrewd suggestion or present-day observation is rendered worthless by the hopelessly uncritical character of the writer's method. Mr. Rhys Davids is perfectly capable of defending himself against the assault of his antagonist; but one misrepresentation of Mr. Lillie must not pass unnoticed. The introduction concludes as follows: "The Rev. Professor Beal, too, has uttered a protest against the 'lectures and articles' of Dr. Rhys Davids, which against all evidence announce that Buddhism 'teaches atheism, annihilation, and the non-existence of soul.'" Everyone would naturally suppose from this that the 'protest' of Mr. Beal (*Romantic History*, p. x.) specified Mr. Davids's writings. Readers will be surprised to learn that Mr. Davids had not then published one line upon the subject, and Mr. Lillie, in applying to him proleptically, as Biblical apologists have it, the language of Mr. Beal has contrived to convey an impression for which there is no justification whatever.

J. E. C.

MR. PERCY GREG'S 'WITHOUT GOD.'*

THE expectation aroused by Mr. Percy Greg's name will be fully answered by his latest book. With much literary skill, with large knowledge gathered from very various sources, and with an evident desire to deal fairly by conflicting views, Mr. Greg here conducts a series of discussions on the questions that are now exercising the minds of most thinking people. The discussions are thrown into the form of dialogue between friends occupying respectively the average Christian, the Theistic Christian, the Cynical Agnostic, the Positivist, and the Secularist positions. In an introductory chapter, Mr. Greg explains his own suspense of mind as the reason for adopting this form of writing.

For more than one strong reason, I could not venture to offer to the many thousands of men who stand much in my own position any confident conclusion, any creed of my own. The form of conversation affords not merely the most convenient, but I think the most truthful, method of laying before my readers the various suggestions which, as the fruit of many years of reading and of thought, may be interesting to those whose minds have been turned in the same direction, but who may have had less time or inclination to work out the results to which, like myself, they feel themselves tending. That form is in some cases especially suited to represent the one conviction I have reached—that there is still a great deal to be said on both sides of the question; a fact too generally overlooked. In a still greater number of instances it affords the best way of putting objections, or of showing where I think that defects of proof or exaggerated inferences may be found in arguments whose general tendency it is impossible to controvert (p. 4).

So that this book has an autobiographical interest of the highest kind. If it is interesting to know the opinions of an able man, it is still more interesting, to those who have the necessary patience, to see the actual process of formation of such a man's opinions. Mr. Greg anticipates the objection that may be brought against him of evading the responsibility of his convictions by quoting the remark of a friend to whom he has been keenly opposed in politics for a quarter of a century, and who defined his (Mr. Greg's) course of life as that of a man who "always chose the side on which his bread was not buttered."

Mr. Greg avows himself a Pessimist. "I do believe that for the present all seems to be going to the worse in this worst of all intelligible worlds." He fears democracy, whose present temper is characterised by 'envy of wealth, jealousy of intelligence, antipathy to an intellectual even more than to an hereditary aristocracy, [which] seem to threaten property, leisure, and education with serious danger.' If this were the place to discuss the question we would point out that by exaggerating one set of facts, and completely ignoring others, Mr. Greg appears to us seriously to misread the signs of the times. But fear even of the

* *Without God: Negative Science and Natural Ethics.* By PERCY GREG. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1893.

democracy is not the greatest that haunts him; he sees also a great and real danger to morality.

I believe firmly that there can be no general—national—universal morality without religion. Religion without a God—a God impersonal or unknowable—are to me contradictions in terms. I admit that many whom I should call Atheists, perhaps a majority of those who avow themselves Atheists, are eminently honest and virtuous men. But I hold, for reasons given hereafter, that their morality contradicts their Atheism; that they have no logical right to their virtues, and that, in the course of half a century at most, their logic will be too strong for their ethical instincts and their unconscious Christian traditions. If I am right in believing that no true morality can long survive Religion, and if they be right in believing that Religion cannot survive enlightenment, Pessimism is not the paradox it seems (p. 8).

Exactly; but how if only the first of these "ifs" is true? And does history warrant the fear that when men's logic comes into conflict with their "ethical instincts" it always wins the day? It seems to us that both actual experience and a true religious philosophy give exactly the opposite verdict.

The book contains 13 chapters on the following subjects:—The Cynic Cosmogony; New Lamps for Old; Chance or Creation; the Paradox of Positivism; Morals of Probability; Woman's Future without Faith; Despair; Inverted Moral Aspects; The Invented Deity; "By their Fruits;" Thin Ice and Snow Bridges; *Cæterum censeo*. But even this list does not exhaust all the subjects discussed or referred to.

Mr. Greg would have done well, we think, to avoid mere allusions to burning questions which do not advance his discussion, and only produce irritation in the minds of many, at least, of his readers. For example, one of the speakers contends that so far from its being true that in an atmosphere of doubt there is a corresponding relaxation of morality, there is, on the contrary, in the present day, an amount of moral enthusiasm such as was never witnessed in any previous age, and here is the reply of the cynical Lestranger:

More whine and cant, certainly. The anti-vivisection agitation—half-a-dozen religious fanatics apart—is a fair specimen of "enthusiastic" morality. A lady who is passionately fond of pets, and cares as little for scientific truth as for fair play, represents the best half of it—that which consists of ignorant women and sentimental men. For the other side—anglers, sportsmen, fox-hunters, and fools at large—they merely

"Make up for sins they are inclined to
By damning those they have no mind to"—

would atone the carnivorous cruelty of their favourite sports by reviling the philanthropic severity of experiments which in a whole year inflict less suffering than a single battue (p. 167).

Our author is not troubled with any suspense of mind with regard to politics. "Mr. Gladstone is in politics what certain favourites of society are called—a privileged man. He may steal the horse where a Radical or a Tory would be hanged for looking over the hedge." "Fifty years ago (he) would not merely have been hurled from office, but would have been hooted from society" (p. 174). "Between Bright's exultation in

the flight of Irish landlords, and Most's apology for tyrannicide, there is barely a difference of degree" (p. 261). This may be smart, but we submit that it is an offence against the canons of literary art and unworthy of the dignified style which we are happy to acknowledge Mr. Greg prevailing maintains to drag such impotent remarks as these into the discussions contained in this book.

There is very little dramatic setting or description of character in the work; the characters are left to reveal themselves in the conversations. Lestrangle, the cynic, interests us most; he and Cleveland the Theist take the lead in the conversation; Merton the Positivist has also a good deal to say, but the rest are little more than lay-figures. It would be easy to quote largely from the book, but after all this would give no idea of its value; we hope many of our readers will be induced to read it for themselves. Perhaps the ablest discussions are those on the bearings of the Evolution Theory on the Design Arguments and on the Positivist pretension to establish a religion by using old words, entirely emptied of their meaning. In the latter especially Lestrangle exposes with relentless logic the moral and spiritual poverty of Positivist resources for realising the Positivist ideal. We only wish he had had for his opponent Mr. Frederic Harrison instead of Merton.

As a further edition of the book will probably be called for, we may mention a slip on p. 134, where Moses is confounded with Elijah. An index of subjects would be helpful for reference. J. H.

A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS EVOLUTION.*

THE Count Goblet d'Alviella is a liberal politician of Belgium, who presided at the first of the series of meetings of the Peace Conference in Brussels, held in October, 1882. It is a new pleasure to the writer of this notice, who heard his inaugural address on that occasion, to welcome in his person, as the author of the present volume, a liberal theologian also.

Count Goblet d'Alviella describes himself in the opening words of his introduction as "étranger à toute église, mais en communion de sentiment avec quiconque cherche à rapprocher la religion de la raison." Surely the *beau idéal* of an observer at once impartial and sympathetic! And this profession, we are bound to say, is carried out in practice to a very unusual extent.

In spite of some errors in detail, the volume before us is, on the whole, a painstaking, a faithful, and a graphic presentation of the state of religion in England, America, and India, in the nineteenth century, preceded by a summary of the evolution of theological opinion in this country, from

* *L'Évolution Religieuse Contemporaine, chez les Anglais, les Américains, et les Hindous.* Par le COMTE GOBLET D'ALVIELLA, Membre de la Chambre des Représentants de Belgique. Bruxelles: Murquardt. 1883.

the times of Henry the Eighth. It is true that in the more general description of the superficial phenomena of religious life in England, contained in the first chapter, the writer appears to allow his love of the picturesque to get the better of his accuracy, as witness the following passage:—

Préparez-vous pénétrer, à la suite d'une initié dans une sorte de cave, où règne une obscurité mystérieuse. Il est possible qu'entre deux hymnes mystiques vous y entendiez nier l'existence de Dieu. Mais vous aurez tout au moins l'occasion de converser avec l'esprit de Jésus et de Mahomet, sinon d'évoquer l'ombre de votre arrière-grand'mère.

We are quite aware that this phase of atheistic spiritualism found an adherent in Harriet Martineau; but we much doubt whether it could be met with in any *séance* nowadays.

The portions to which we naturally turn with most interest are those which relate to the impressions of the writer, derived from personal observation during two visits to England. The heart of the typical Unitarian must surely swell with pardonable pride to find how prominent a part Unitarianism, as such, according to Count Goblet d'Alviella, has played, and still plays, in the "*Évolution Religieuse Contemporaine*." "In general," we read at the close of the third chapter, after a review of the Broad Church movement, "of all Protestant communions, the Unitarian Church, as will be seen from the following chapter, is the only one which has fully and officially renounced every intellectual trammel." Count Goblet d'Alviella has plainly fallen into the hands of very liberal-minded Unitarians, and as plainly misinterpreted their declarations of personal conviction, as representative confessions of faith. In the first place, as the late W. J. Lamport was never weary of repeating, there is no such thing as a Unitarian Church. In the second place, the "Unitarian body," as some of its admirers love to call it, has no means of officially renouncing or officially pronouncing any opinion whatsoever. In the third place, there is a very large and influential section of Unitarians who are by no means disposed to countenance any such absolute freedom as that which the Count at once attributes to Unitarians *en masse*, and by implication eulogises as their exclusive possession.

In reference to Priestley's declaration, "The belief in these facts [*i. e.*, the miracles] constitutes what I call the faith of Christendom," our author makes an observation, which we especially commend to the attention of a recent critic of modern Unitarianism, Dr. Putnam. "It contributed," he says, "not a little to the reputation for religious dryness and coldness which weighed so long on English Unitarianism." And this is the very faith which our modern reactionaries would rehabilitate as the only hope of reviving religious ardour amongst Unitarians! In justice, however, even to these reactionaries, we feel compelled to add, that when Count Goblet d'Alviella cites the eloquent sermon of Mr. R. A. Armstrong, on the "Desolation of Jerusalem," as a proof that all "prévisions pessimistes" of a "relâchement et lassitude dans la ferveur religieuse," have been "complètement démenties par les faits," we do

not think that he has presented his readers with a full or fair statement of the case. All that Mr. Armstrong says in that sermon as a personal declaration and confession has our full sympathy, as far as it goes. But Mr. Armstrong himself admits, though our author does not quote this part of the sermon, that Unitarians, whether more or less zealous than of yore, are at all events not zealous enough to have any reasonable hope of converting the Church and the unchurched multitudes to their faith. And neither Mr. Armstrong nor the Count d'Alviella seems to us sufficiently to recognise the influence of that growing conviction of the essential relativity of truth, which is the really important outcome of the critical and historical movement, regarded as part and parcel of the entire intellectual ferment of our time, and which must, in exact proportion as it deepens and extends, paralyse the propagandist nerve.

We had marked for notice some of the errors in matters of detail, into which, as we have said, the author has fallen—errors which were, perhaps, inevitable, and which do not seriously affect the general trustworthiness of his representations. We cannot stay to enumerate and correct them here; and we have not left ourselves room to do even the scantest justice to our author's interesting survey of Conwayism, Comtism, Spencerism, American Transcendentalism, and last, but not least, his careful and eminently impartial account of the Brahmo Samáj, and its various developments and splits. In conclusion, we should like to cite a few of the closing sentences with which the Count Goblet d'Alviella sums up the results of his interesting investigation. Among these results is his prevision, in the Religion of the Future, of a growing secularisation of the Church in the best and noblest sense of these words. Knowing that our author was more or less associated in his peace projects and parliamentary liberalism with Emile de Laveleye, to whom he dedicates his work, we feared that, whatever was the breadth of his mind in other respects, he was irretrievably committed to that middle-class Mancunianism which never can and never will understand and lay to heart the socialistic aspirations of our age. But the last words of this valuable volume lead us to hope better things.

Nos sciences positives concluent de plus en plus à l'écrasement du faible par le fort dans le combat pour l'existence; la foi prochaine aura à réagir contre cette apothéose de la force et asseoir sur une base religieuse les droits de l'individu. Notre régime économique n'a pas tenu les espérances dont s'étaient un instant bercés nos pères; la foi prochaine aura non seulement à nous proposer sa solution du problème de la souffrance et du mal, mais encore à nous offrir un remède pour introduire plus de justice dans les relations des hommes.

Except as auguries such safe generalities as these do not indeed go far. But so far as they do go we are thankful for such auguries, coming from one who has thought it worth his while to give to Unitarianism so prominent a place in contemporary religious evolution—*Quod omen felix faustumque sit.*

E. M. G.

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.*

THIS extensive cyclopædia of Protestant Theology is the successor of that which was begun and carried on to its close by the late Professor Herzog of Halle and Erlangen, with the co-operation of many scholars. It professes to be a second edition, improved throughout and enlarged. During the publication of its volumes Herzog died; and his co-editor Plitt soon followed him. Since then it has been conducted by Professor Hauck of Erlangen. The value of such a work can hardly be over-rated. We are glad to see that it is to be completed in fifteen volumes; whereas its predecessor reached to more than twenty. The theological standpoint of the writers is moderate orthodoxy, and therefore some of the ablest writers in Germany are excluded. The reader will look in vain for the names of Pfleiderer, Overbeck, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, Wellhausen, and others.

The last two volumes which have appeared are the eleventh and twelfth, including "Göttinger-Ring." In looking through them we find several excellent articles, especially those on "Prophetenthum," "Rationalismus," "Religionsphilosophie," "Origen," "Pantheismus," "Pentateuch," and "Palästina." The last is very long, extending to upwards of eighty pages. That upon "Polycarp" is not altogether satisfactory; nor is the "Prediger Salomo" sufficient. "Psalmen" is by Professor Delitzsch, as before; but we cannot pronounce it excellent. "Pseudepigraphen," by Dillmann, is good. The articles "Paulus and Petrus" are indifferent; nor can that on "Philo" be called excellent. "Palästina," by Schultz, is exhaustive and masterly. Long as it is, no reader will find fault on that account.

We looked for the name of Gloucester Ridley, but it is absent; as was that of Bishop Butler, from an early volume. Yet four pages are devoted to Archdeacon Paley, and upwards of four to Theodore Parker. The article "Puritaner," consisting of thirty pages, is from the pen of Dr. Schoell, of London.

The biographical, historical, and geographical articles are the best. Those on the various books of the Old and New Testaments hardly represent the present state of criticism. Here the reader must rather look to Schenkel's "Bibellexicon."

Each volume is in royal octavo, and contains eight hundred pages.

An English translation of this cyclopædia would be a great boon to students of the Bible; but we fear that no London publisher would undertake the expense. The taste of the day favours novels so much as to divert the public mind from higher and serious literature.

S. DAVIDSON.

* *Real-Encyklopædie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, u.s.w. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1883.

PROFESSOR DELITZSCH'S HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.

IN the fifth edition of the Hebrew New Testament, edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society, by Professor Delitzsch of Leipzig—a work carefully executed—there are several things still which need alteration and correction. We have dipped into the volume in several places, and have found words incorrect or unsuitable. Thus for ἄγγελοι θεοῦ in Hebrews i. 6, Elohim is put; a plural which never signifies *angels*. In Galatians vi. 18, אחי "my brethren," with a pause accent, is not the proper representative of ἀδελφοί alone. In Matthew xxii. 37, and Luke x. 27, כִּידַע is given for διδασκα, which is not the best word. The Septuagint has for it συνεῖδης in Ecclesiastes x. 20. In John viii. 44, הַכֹּזֵב is introduced after אָבִי at the end of the verse, giving an interpretation more than doubtful. The uncertainty of the original Greek should have been retained.

In Acts iii. 16, הָאֲרוֹכָה is not the best equivalent for δολοκληρία; the proper word is כְּתֵם. In Romans ii. 4, for μακροθυμία there should be אָרֶךְ רַחוּם אֲפִים not אָרֶךְ רַחוּם. In Philipians ii. 6, the difficult word ἀπαγαγόν is rendered by שָׁלַל, which fails to give the true sense. In Jude 19, the rendering הַפְּרָשִׁים מִן הַצִּבּוֹר "who separate from the congregation," is too free, being an interpretation rather than a translation. And the interpretation is an incorrect one, for, according to the true reading, the meaning of the Greek is, "who create schisms." In Hebrews xi. 10, the word "foundations" is rendered, by a singular noun יסודתה "its foundation," whereas the plural of יסוד should be used.

In Revelation xiii. 2, נִדְרָפִים stands for βλασφημία, which is too mild a word, since it means "reproaches;" נִאֲצָה is a better substitute. In Revelation xiii. 4, a better verb than שָׁבִים would be תָּמִיה. The Hithpael of שָׁבִים does not occur in the Bible with אחרי after it. In Revelation xxi. 11 אור is the wrong word for the Greek φωστήρ. it should be מֵאוֹר. The text, taken as the basis, is the Elzevir of 1624; but several various and better readings are indicated in different parts. A critical text should have been adopted, such as Tischendorf's last, to which Delitzsch himself is favourable. But the Bible Society seems to stand in the way of such an innovation, however desirable at the present day.

S. D.

'THE FREEDOM OF FAITH.'

THIS is an American volume of sermons distinctly above the average, with a prefatory essay on "The New Theology," which gives the keynote of the volume. The representatives of the "New Theology," upon which these sermons are based, are Erskine, Maurice, Stanley, Robertson, Bushnell, &c.; and Mr. Munger himself appears to be one of those who is able to put a very real life (with most unorthodox explanations) into what is known as orthodox phraseology. It is a little difficult for readers, who have long been accustomed to drink the new wine from new bottles, to understand the precise advantage of retaining all the old bottles; but, at the same time, it is satisfactory to see a minister, whose lot has been cast among men who insist on using the old bottles, filling them with very excellent new wine. And so long as writers of this school deal with the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Justification, and so forth, there is little difficulty in putting any meaning they like into these phrases. Some confusion may arise, but no great harm is done, by our using a word to-day in a different sense from that in which it was used some centuries ago. But what is to become of historical theology if this process is applied to the Bible and we are told that "it may mean to-morrow more than it means to-day"? And again, "when there is such an accumulation of knowledge and of evidence against the apparent meaning that the mind cannot tolerate the inconsistency, it must search the text to see if it will not bear a meaning—indeed, was intended to convey a meaning which we have failed to catch—consistent with ascertained facts. It is already a familiar process, as illustrated in the treatment of the first chapters of Genesis." Surely the application of this process to the first chapters of Genesis is its *reductio ad absurdum*. The sermons themselves are very much more satisfactory than this prefatory essay. In them as much of the orthodox phraseology as it is not natural to the preacher to use is quietly dropped, and such statements of the Bible as are inconsistent with facts are quietly left alone, which is the best thing to do with them, except when we are engaged in the historical and literary study of religion. The spirit of the discourses is the true Christian spirit; there is both breadth and depth, and a clear consciousness of the realities of human life, and the reality of Christ and of God which makes it possible truly to live. They may be read with profit by any one who will bear in mind that the writer is not, and does not claim to be, an authority on scriptural questions, confessing, for example, that he does not know whether the Song of Solomon is a song of human love or "of the yearning delight of God in His Church."

F. H. J.

The Freedom of Faith. By THEODORE T. MUNGER. London: James Clarke and Co. 1883.

WILLIAM BALLANTYNE HODGSON.*

THOSE who had the privilege of reckoning themselves amongst the friends, or pupils, or occasional hearers of Dr. Hodgson, or even those who merely had the opportunity of meeting him once or twice in social intercourse, must have retained a clear impression of his striking personality, and they will turn with great interest to the *Life and Letters* which Mr. Meiklejohn has edited. No doubt the attractiveness of his character, and the very strong influence he possessed over those who came into close contact with him as fellow-workers, or as learners, was due in considerable measure to his personal presence, and the contagion of his energy and enthusiasm, and no memoir could give an adequate impression of this. It is this personal element of manner and temperament that is especially brought out and illustrated by Mr. Woodhead in his *Student Recollections*, which is an interesting supplement to the fuller representation of the man and his work. From both we see the intense interest and zeal which penetrated to every detail of any task he undertook, and drew out the best that was in all his fellow-workers, and which, in his lectures on Political Economy, made the hackneyed title of "the dismal science" seem ludicrously inappropriate.

Dr. Hodgson's labours in the cause of education and in the science which of all others he held to be most needful to the education of a good citizen—Political Economy—are recorded in detail in the *Life*, and amply illustrated in the *Letters*. Hodgson's early boyhood was not a happy one, but a few glimpses are given which make us wish to have been told more about it, and we should not unwillingly have sacrificed for this some of the many later pages in which are recorded at length his opinions on things in general. In spite of over-work, over-excitement, and a certain amount of self-torment, the true strength of his character developed itself under a somewhat hard discipline. He distinguished himself at school and at college, and went out into the world well equipped, and looking out with eagerness for his proper mission. His first important engagement was as Secretary of the Mechanics' Institute of Liverpool, which was (and is), in fact, a very large and successful school, in which, when Dr. Hodgson left it after some seven years of service, first as Secretary and then as Principal, between two and three thousand boys and girls were being educated. After this he was for four years Principal of an important High School in Manchester, remaining steadfast to what he felt to be his true vocation, and declining some tempting offers of more lucrative or more conspicuous posts. After a term of good service here

* *Life and Letters of William Ballantyne Hodgson, LL.D.*, late Professor of Economic Science in the University of Edinburgh. Edited by J. M. D. MEIKLEJOHN, M.A., Professor of the Theory, &c., of Education in the University of St. Andrews. Edinburgh: Douglas. 1893.

Student Recollections of Professor Hodgson. By ERNEST WOODHEAD. Edinburgh: Pentland. 1893.

he spent a few years in comparative leisure for study and for seeing the world, and they furnish material for two or three interesting chapters, containing extracts from his letters from abroad,—some of them written in Paris at the time of the *coup d'état*. In another chapter some curious passages are given from his experience as a member of the Royal Commission of 1858, appointed to inquire into the state of Primary Education. His next settled home, after various wanderings, was in London, and he set himself to serve the cause of unsectarian education as a member of the Council of University College. The circumstance, however, of the rejection of the foremost candidate for the chair of philosophy, on the ground of his being a Unitarian minister, was regarded by him as a gross breach of the unsectarian constitution of the college,—and he shook off the dust of his feet against it, as Professor de Morgan had done, in disgust and disappointment. From London he presently removed to Edinburgh, and established himself in a picturesque home on the slopes of the Pentland Hills,—Bonaly Tower—of which both Mr. Meiklejohn and Mr. Woodhead give us a most fascinating picture. Here, with his wife and children, he “practically kept open house, for he used to say, ‘All roads lead to Bonaly as well as to Mecca.’”

Dr. Hodgson was invited in 1871 to fill the newly founded chair of Economic Science in the University of Edinburgh, and though the professorship took him a great deal away from his home, and entailed much hard labour and many new cares, he did not long hesitate, but yielded to the call, and went heart and soul into the work. Mr. Woodhead's Recollections are chiefly of Professor Hodgson in the class-room, and they make us feel what the features were of his teaching and personal influence which so attracted his pupils and attached them to him with real affection. They are also well brought out in a letter which Mr. Eric Robertson contributes to the Memoir. Dr. Hodgson had a profound belief in the humane and beneficent character of the science which it was his vocation to expound, and we can imagine the indignation he would feel at Mr. Ruskin's invectives against Political Economy, or rather against the doctrines which he attributes to the Political Economists. Mr. Woodhead describes the Lectures on Ruskin, which must at any rate have been vigorous and racy; and we notice that he has taken care to report the generous and appreciative tone in which Dr. Hodgson spoke (as we felt sure he must have done) of that side of Mr. Ruskin's teaching, in morals as well as art, which he could not but recognise as high and true, and of his aims, always humane and lofty, however queer or impossible might be the schemes by which he seeks to attain them. Mr. Meiklejohn hardly does justice to Dr. Hodgson when he fails to set this off against the severity or ridicule with which he treated Mr. Ruskin's counterblasts to Political Economy. And the same thing strikes us in connection with the view he took of the American civil war. However firmly he stuck to his original partisanship for the Southern States, and however blind he continued to be to the real causes and issues of the war, we cannot believe that he never found occasion to say a generous word

for the North, or to recognise the devotion and self-sacrifice of its noblest sons.

The copious extracts from Dr. Hodgson's correspondence contain a very full expression of his opinions on all the subjects in which he was chiefly interested, in religion, politics, education, economic science, &c. A good deal that is printed cannot be said to be specially original or brilliant, and much that was new and even startling at the time, especially in the matter of education, has the disadvantage for readers to-day of having long been accepted and taken for granted amongst the common-places of public opinion. Dr. Hodgson's religious views would be classed under the conveniently general term Liberal Christianity; but he did not identify himself with any particular church or theological school, and was content to leave more questions open than the theologians will generally tolerate. He held that all true religion has its root in ethics; and his creed was of a very practical kind. His strong personal feeling of simple and earnest devotion is testified to in the prayers written for use in his family, several of which are printed in an appendix to the Memoir. Dr. Hodgson was only sixty-five years old when he died,—four years ago. His career had been as full as a life well could be of strongly-felt interests, of energetic work and diligent study, and generous self-devotion to the cause of education in the fullest sense of the word. He accomplished unfortunately very little connected literary work, and perhaps the most characteristic of his productions will be those lectures on Ruskin's *Unto this Last*, to which we have referred, and which it seems are not unlikely to be published as he had himself intended. His true "works" are in the impulses and the guidance to a high ideal of manly life, which went out from him through all his career; and the Memoir, the leading points of interest in which we have been able merely to touch upon, contains abundant material for those high thoughts of duty and devotedness, which it was his one aim to impart to his scholars as the inspiration and motive of their lives.

MR. EDWIN ARNOLD'S 'INDIAN IDYLLS.*

MR. EDWIN ARNOLD has a very distinct mission, as the skilled interpreter of a poetical literature which is all but a sealed book for us in England. He is a poet, and a Sanskrit scholar, and has a keen appreciation of the beauty and truth embodied in the legends belonging to the earlier and purer forms of the Hindu mythology, and a clear insight into their deeper meanings. We only lament that his fulfilment of his mission has to be confined to the too short intervals of business when he can escape from the atmosphere of Fleet-street into the realm of noble thought and high imaginings which is revealed in this new volume he has given us. The ordinary reader of the books that deal with the Hindoo literature, finds it hard to get anything more than a

* *Indian Idylls*, from the Sanskrit of the Mahābhārata. By EDWIN ARNOLD. London: Trübner. 1883.

confused and bewildering impression of the two extraordinary poems, as long as seven Iliads and Odysseys put together, which, Mr. Arnold says, "contain almost all the history of ancient India, so far as it can be recovered; together with such inexhaustible details of its political, social and religious life, that the antique Hindoo world really stands epitomised in them." We do not know to what extent the whole mass is penetrated by that pure vein of poetry which has furnished Mr. Arnold with the Idylls here presented to us: no doubt he has selected the most beautiful of the episodes, romantic, pathetic, or heroic, and it is the sweeter breath of the earliest days of Hindoo faith which is the inspiration of their poetry. Nor are we in a position to judge how much of the beauty of their expression is simply transferred from one language into another, and how much may be due to our English artist, judging his work, of course, according to our modern critical standards of literary excellence. All we can say is (and it is quite enough), that we are introduced into a world of beautiful romance in which we see how close together are the deepest springs of religion and of poetry; and, while the English verse is of the quality which we should expect from Mr. Arnold's practised hand, it has distinctly the tone and colouring of the land of its birth, and both in its passages of primitive simplicity and intensity of expression, and in its characteristic scenery and imagery, and mythology, it has a consistent unity of spirit and of form.

But after all, the intrinsic value of these Idylls is in the pure pleasure and refreshment of soul they give us, the power they have to carry us out of "this nineteenth century of ours" and bring us into fellowship for a few moments with the children of another world, a world of feeling and thought and faith strange to us both in its contrasts and its resemblances to our own. The depth and tenderness of human love and self-sacrifice and self-devotion have seldom been more touchingly portrayed;—the mysteries of life and death seldom shadowed forth in more impressive figures, than in some of these poems. There is the story of Sāvitrī and Satyavān which, as Mr. Monier Williams remarks, "for true poetic feeling and pathos, is not excelled by that of Admetus and Alcestitis," and from which, we might add, the jarring note of the husband's selfishness is absent. There is that other story of a wife's fidelity and devotion in "Nala and Damayanti," which was made known to English readers some fifty years ago by Dean Milman in a metrical translation, but one that aimed at a literal rendering, line for line, and was certainly "better adapted to aid the student than adequately to reproduce the swift march of narrative and old-world charm of the Indian tale." There is the fine conception of the Birth of Death, Brahma discontented because his Creation being perfect was unchanging and wearying in its monotony; and from the power of his discontent unconsciously to himself, there went forth

A flame, the spirit of His brooding thought,
Which, filling all the regions, had consumed
The heavens and earth and worlds . . .
So was that thought of Brahma terrible.

Then from his later thought of pity Death is born as a beautiful "Presence feminine," and she is bidden to go forth and slay all living things, each in his time, and for the good of all. She weeps and entreats to be spared such a dreadful duty,—

Thereat there spread in heaven
Silence a space, whilst Death, for love of men,
Gazed on the face of God, and that dread face
Waxed well contented : and great Brahma smiled
Looking upon His creatures, who therewith
Fared well throughout the three wide worlds, because
The countenance of Him was glad again.
So passed she forth from the Almighty Presence, mute,
This tender angel sent to slay mankind,
Refusing still to slay.

Then for countless ages she does penance and pilgrimage, and offers prayer and sacrifice for men, and at last obtains from Brahma that the stroke shall not be given by her hand, but men's sins shall slay them and die so with them.

"Thus it shall be," spake Brahma. "Go, fair child,
Fulfil My purpose, make death enter so ;
Thou shalt be blameless now and evermore.
See ! the bright tears that fell upon my hand
From forth thine eyes, I turn to woes of flesh
Which shall consume them—aches, diseases, griefs.
Born of thy sorrow these will smite ; but, born
Of thy compassion, these shall heal with peace,
When the day cometh that each one must die.
Fear not ; thou shalt be innocent ; thou art
The solace as the terror of all flesh,
Righteous and rightful, doing Brahma's will."

Perhaps the finest and most impressive of all is the story of the Great Journey, and the Entry into Heaven, with its high lessons of fidelity and love and self-sacrifice, as when the saint and hero, Yudhishthira, arriving at the gate of Heaven, refuses to enter in unless the dog who has followed him faithfully through his journey may be admitted also, and afterwards when he does not find in Heaven the fellow travellers who had sunk, one after another, on the way, he will have none of its joys for himself, but sets forth to seek them and share their pains in Hell ; and there, hearing the voices of his loved ones calling to him from amidst the darkness and horror,

That soul fear could not shake, nor trials tire,
Burned terrible with tenderness, the while
His eyes searched all the gloom, his planted feet
Stood fast in the mid horrors. Well-nigh, then,
He cursed the gods : well-nigh that steadfast mind
Broke from its faith in virtue. But he stayed
Th' indignant passion, softly speaking this
Unto the angel : "Go to those thou serv'st ;
Tell them I come not thither. Say I stand
Here in the throat of hell, and here will bide—
Nay, if I perish—while my well-belov'd
Win ease and peace by any pains of mine."

How the dog proved to be Dharma's self who had assumed that shape to try Yudhishthira's fidelity to the meanest comrade; and how the souls, for whose sake he would have forfeited the special place of honour reserved for him in heaven nearest to the gods were only doomed to suffer a short while the pains of hell that should purify them from some lingering trace of earthly evil—all this must be read in the poem itself. We know nothing like it in the literature of any mythology for its deep and simple pathos and tender humanity, and for the peculiar intensity of its appeal to all that is best and holiest in human life, and there is a refined beauty and noble dignity of its poetical form which is altogether worthy of its spirit. One only of the Idyls which Mr. Arnold has included in his selection seems to us somewhat out of harmony with the rest; for, though it may help to give us an idea of the variety of the material which the Mahābhārata contains, "The Saint's Temptation," with its lighter tone and a suggestion of the sensuous, jars a little upon the tender feeling or solemn religious beauty of the rest, and we should have liked the volume better without it. For the book, as a whole, we are profoundly grateful to Mr. Arnold. It will take its place amongst the most truly religious literature of any time, and amongst the freshest sources of intellectual pleasure and purifying and elevating thought and feeling.

THE POEMS OF JONES VERY.*

WE have delayed noticing this beautiful little book of religious poetry, because one who knew Mr. Very, and knowing him loved and revered him, desired to pay a tribute here to his memory. Unhappily, illness has prevented him from doing this, and we must ourselves undertake the pleasant duty of briefly calling attention to the clear and sweet voice that speaks in these delicate spiritual poems which have come to us from across the Atlantic. Mr. Andrews has furnished a very graceful and sympathetic sketch of Mr. Very's character. He belonged to that circle of choice spirits of which Mr. Emerson was the centre in the bright "Concord Days." Or rather we should say he was in it but not altogether of it. He lived apart, in a world of high spiritual communion, in which he believed (or, shall we say, he knew) that he received messages direct from God, to deliver to the world. In writing the poems, which came from his pen with wonderful fluency, he regarded himself as "but a reed through which the Spirit might breathe a music of its own." He startled, and, it appears, sometimes shocked people by his unhesitating confidence in the voice that spoke within him; and at one time he was under the influence of a certain over-strained mystical exaltation or exhilaration which made some of his friends anxious about his sanity. By kind counsel and sympathy he was restored to a calmer mood, while happily, he never lost his glad and inspiring faith in the word spoken to

* *Poems by Jones Very.* With an Introductory Memoir by WILLIAM P. ANDREWS. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. 1883.

him in his communings with the unseen, his belief that "every man who made the complete sacrifice of self necessary to the identification with, the hiding in Christ, would become the voice of the Holy Ghost." Dr. Channing said of Mr. Very that "to hear him talk was like looking into the purely spiritual world, into truth itself. He had nothing of self-exaggeration, but seemed to have attained to self-annihilation, and to have become an oracle of God." Emerson wrote of him in his diary, "Jones Very is gone into the multitude as solitary as Jesus. In dismissing him I seem to have discharged an arrow into the heart of Society. Wherever that young enthusiast goes he will astonish and disconcert men, by dividing for them the cloud that covers the gulf in man." A brother minister said that to have walked with him was to have walked with God; and another, that he was "as good as goodness, and as true as truth. With his knowledge and wisdom he was simple as a child, transparent, artless." All that Mr. Andrews tells us of Mr. Very's comparatively uneventful life is in perfect harmony with these testimonies to the extreme beauty and simplicity of his character; and we see in it all the same spirit from above, the spirit of truth and love and rapt devotion, which is in all his poetry.

The poems, which are chiefly in the Sonnet form, though not following the strict rules of the Sonnet, have a delicate spiritual charm which consists essentially in the fact that they are the absolutely simple unstudied expression of their author's inmost being. The thought seems to take upon itself a rhythm and music that naturally belong to it; and not a few of the Sonnets are remarkable for a certain refined grace and transparent sincerity and intrinsic harmony, the secret of which many a student of literary art would be glad to learn.

Mr. Andrews has selected about a hundred Sonnets, arranging them in groups under the headings, The Call, The New Birth, The Message, Nature, and The Beginning and the End; and there is a section, of Song and Praise, containing thirty-three short poems, chiefly lyrical. All are written in the same devoutly meditative or receptive mood, the divine "message" reverently delivered in simple sincerity of heart; and they form a beautiful and welcome addition to the literature of spiritual religion. Their author would have utterly repudiated any claim for them as works of art; but they have a beauty of expression as well as of thought and feeling, the charm of which no one can fail to recognise who is in sympathy with the spirit of faith and love which breathes in every line.

PROFESSOR KNIGHT'S EDITION OF WORDSWORTH'S POEMS.*

WE had no room in our last number to mention the new volume (the fourth) which had appeared of the Library edition of Wordsworth's Poems, completing the first half of the work, the plan

* *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*. Edited by WILLIAM KNIGHT, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, St. Andrew's. Vol. IV. Edinburgh: W. Paterson. 1883.

and execution of which we have described in detail in previous notices. The new instalment includes several of the poems in which Wordsworth's genius attained its highest artistic expression, such as the "Ode on Immortality," the "Character of the Happy Warrior," and the "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle." These, and others to be classed with them or near them, were originally given to the world in their finished beauty which, as we see from the absence of various readings of any importance, no fastidious self-criticism has induced the author to attempt to improve upon. "The White Doe of Rylstone," on the contrary, was carefully worked over, after it had gone through four editions. The alterations made generally do something in the way of remedying the defects in style, which the author confessed himself conscious of in "the business parts" of the poem. But, with the critical faculty quickened by the sight of the numerous corrections, it is impossible not to notice the many flat and prosaic lines still remaining, which no amount of painstaking revision could have effectually reformed. They are chiefly in those passages, such as the description of the Rising of the North, where it is impossible to avoid thinking how differently Sir Walter Scott would have told the story; a comparison against which, however, Wordsworth put in a mild protest as "inconsiderate." We are guilty, no doubt, of heresy, but we have never been able to share all the poet's own intense interest in this poem, and his estimate of its importance amongst his works; though we fully appreciate the beauty of many parts of it, and the purity and nobleness of its teaching.

The pleasure of seeing in the beautiful type of this edition, the collected "Prefaces" and other prose matter that is associated with the poems, has suggested a hope that the Editor and Publisher may conspire, when their present undertaking is finished, to give us the Prose works in the same admirable form, and with the same careful and judicious editing. At present they are only to be had in Dr. Grosart's far from satisfactory edition, with much added miscellaneous matter, the best part of which, Mr. Aubrey de Vere's charming Recollections of the poet, we may hope to see reproduced in its natural connection with other of Mr. de Vere's valuable Wordsworthian studies. A complete collection of the Letters can probably not be made yet. Dr. Grosart's is much too imperfect to be considered even a fairly representative selection.

MR. CHADWICK'S 'IN NAZARETH TOWN.'*

MR. CHADWICK'S new little book of verse is not one to criticise or to weigh against the works of the poets of established name and fame, but is one to be accepted and enjoyed in a quiet hour, and a mood for being simply pleased. It has the charm of graceful expression, with a constant undertone of tender religious feeling; and there is a

* *In Nazareth Town, a Christmas Fantasy; and other Poems.* By JOHN W. CHADWICK. Boston: Roberts. 1883.

fresh and sweet breath of poetry both in word and in spirit. In the poem which gives its name to the volume, we have a pretty picture of the village and the home that have just been made glad by the birth of Mary's son. Then there is the thought of the sorrows, happily unforeseen, and the unimagined glory and exaltation; and again of the true human glory, yet to be restored,—the breaking of the "dawn of better things."

But all of this to thee is strange
As, safe from every harm
Thou liest, soft and warm and sweet,
Upon thy mother's arm.

There are some graceful little poems, touched with a gentle pathos or kindly humour, about little ones in our own homes, as "The Unknown Tongue," "Little Hannah," "Under the Snow;" and there are greetings to friends, commemorative verses, &c., half-a-dozen sonnets, and a ballad or two. They might almost all be classed as "poems of the affections"—affections human and divine inseparably associated. We must content ourselves with giving one of the briefer poems in illustration of what we have said of Mr. Chadwick's muse.

A DEDICATION.

My darling boy, kissed but a moment since,
And laid away all rosy in the dark,
Is talking to himself. What does he say?
Not much, in truth that I can understand;
But now and then, among the pretty sounds
That he is making, falls upon my ear
My name. And then the sand-man softly comes
Upon him, and he sleeps,
And what am I,
Here in my book, but as a little child
Trying to cheer the big and silent dark
With foolish words? But listen, O my God,
My Father, and among them thou shalt hear
Thy name. And soon I too shall sleep.
When I awake I shall be still with thee.

CHRISTIANITY THE SCIENCE OF MANHOOD.*

IT is not quite clear why Christianity should be called the "Science" of manhood, or of anything else. As treated of by Mr. Savage it might, perhaps, be more appropriately called the "Art" of manhood; for the object of his very clear and reasonable argument is to show that Christianity presents, as no other religion does, the ideal of the manly life, and also supplies the motive power for the realisation of that ideal in character and conduct. Taking the "religious faculty" as the distinguishing

* Modern Handbooks of Religion. *Christianity the Science of Manhood.* By MINOT J. SAVAGE. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

characteristic of man, he shows how Christianity, the essence of which he defines as "love to God and love to man," ensures the due working and true harmony of the faculties which man shares with the brute creation, the physical, the intellectual and the affectional. A review is given, too brief to be quite satisfactory and judicial in all respects, though sufficient, perhaps, for the immediate occasion, of the great world-religions; Christianity alone, reduced to its simplest elements, being considered to contain the essentials of a universal religion. Mr. Savage intimates that if he were writing the book to-day he might in some respects modify this part of his argument; and there seems to be no reason why before sanctioning its re-publication here he should not have put it into more exact accord with his present thought. However it is only fair to say that while admitting that it does not express *all* his thoughts even on the subject of which it treats, he believes it to be "in the main, not only true but grandly true." We agree, also "in the main," with this estimate of it. It appeals thoughtfully and earnestly to the conscience and moral experience of men, and what we might call their religious common sense; and it is well calculated to guide and help perplexed minds, tossed between an unspiritual dogmatism on the one hand and an entire negation of belief on the other. We heartily wish success to the series of "Handbooks of Modern Religion," of which the present is the opening volume.

MR. BALDWIN BROWN'S NEW BOOK ON THE HOME.*

SEVENTEEEN years after the publication of his popular book, *Home Life in the Light of its Divine Idea*, Mr. Baldwin Brown returns to the theme, endeavouring, he says, to adapt his argument "to the new state of things that is establishing itself for the time among us, under the influence of a philosophy which we may fairly describe as 'falsely so-called,' if we are to rate it according to its own claim as the system of the future." His aim is "to show how the home is the key to the life of man as a citizen of a yet wider world; and to trace the method by which, in the counsel and purpose of God, this sin-tormented earth may be made homelike once more." In dealing, as he does, with so much that is most real and most deeply felt in life, Mr. Brown has a great deal to say which must command the assent of all religious minds, whatever their theology may be. No doubt some of his arguments and illustrations will be wanting in point to the reader who does not hold the author's view of the authority of Scripture, and certain doctrines are put forth or implied which will receive by no means a unanimous assent. But we have learnt to think more of the truth taught than of the theological dialect in which it is uttered, and Mr. Baldwin Brown has so much that is true and

* *The Home: in its Relations to Man and to Society.* By JAMES BALDWIN BROWN, B.A. London: James Clarke. 1893.

excellent to say that we have no inclination to stop to take exception, as we might sometimes do, to the way in which he puts it, or to single out for criticism the points (chiefly theological) in which we do not agree with him. There is an admirable discourse on the Dependents of the Home, which neither masters and mistresses nor servants could read without profit; and amongst others which contain much wise counsel in household duties and comfort in household sorrows, we may mention especially those on the Children of the Home, the Discipline of the Home, the Sacred Sorrow, and the Sacred Burden of the Home.

A COMMENTARY ON THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

IT is rather late to notice Prebendary Humphry's Commentary; but there may be some of our readers who do not happen to know of it, and will be glad to hear of a book in which they will find a concise statement of the grounds for every new rendering of importance in the revised version. Mr. Humphry, who speaks with authority, as one of the N. T. Company, though his work is done on his own responsibility, does not necessarily pronounce his own opinion as to the character of the changes he marks, nor does he undertake to defend the revision against all objectors; but it is evident that he is generally satisfied with the reasons which he reports. We would not venture to say how far his statement of the case as a whole is likely to satisfy the severer critics of the revision, or to reconcile the uncritical adherents of the authorised version to the changes which have so much disturbed them; but it will be of real service in providing both classes of readers with the materials for forming a reasonable judgment. An interesting feature of the Commentary is the very frequent reference to the renderings given in the earlier English versions, as well as in the Vulgate, showing often that the change that has been made is not really an innovation, but a reversion to the language of the older translation. Mr. Humphry has not kept his own theological opinions altogether out of sight, and he lets us see how, in certain cases, the doctrinal assumptions of the majority of the revisers were allowed to influence their decision, as, for instance, in the distinction between "Holy Ghost" and "Holy Spirit." The occasional comments which he makes from a dogmatic point of view, or with an eye to edification generally, can be taken by the reader for what they are worth, as also may the judgments pronounced on questions of literary taste. In almost all cases where the reader wants information it is given succinctly and fairly, and for those especially who have not the necessary scholarship or the necessary leisure for working out the matter at first hand, no more useful and convenient critical apparatus could well be provided.

* *A Commentary on the Revised Version of the New Testament.* By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D., Vicar of St. Martin in the Fields, Prebendary of St. Paul's. London: Cassell, 1882.

+

MR. KIRBY ON EVOLUTION AND NATURAL THEOLOGY.*

WE find in Mr. Kirby's interesting book, a clear and intelligible statement of the doctrines of Evolution in the realms of physical life, and many well-conceived illustrations of them, drawn chiefly from Zoology, which is his own special department of science. The points Mr. Kirby has endeavoured specially to establish are (1) the worthlessness of the opinions of antiquity on matters of natural science; (2) the great superiority from a scientific point of view, as well as in physical and moral evidence, of the theory of Evolution over that of Special Creation; (3) that Evolution is perfectly consistent with an enlightened theism. The first of these points is necessarily dealt with in rather a summary way, and the author ventures now and then into regions where he is not so much at home as when he is concerned with the discoveries and theories of modern science. He thinks, for instance, that the Hindu Trimurti may point to the triple powers of the sun's rays—the heat, the light, and the chemical rays; and there is great virtue in the word "if," when he says, "If Higgins is correct in his ingenious interpretation of the exoteric meaning of the first verse in Genesis, 'By wisdom the Trimurti regenerated the planets and the earth.' " Biblical criticism is not Mr. Kirby's strong point; but the two or three notes which betray this have nothing to do with the main argument. In the chapters on Darwin and his Critics, Use and Disuse, Homology, Geographical Distribution, Variation under Domestication, Course of Development on the Earth, and other special topics illustrating the objections to the theory of Special Creations and the arguments in favour of the methods of Evolution, the reader will find the fruit of much careful observation and reflection. A chapter that might with advantage have been expanded beyond its three short pages, just touches on the harmony of Nature, and the author concludes that "the theory of Evolution accounts for both the harmonies and the discords of Nature, and while reconciling both with the infinite beneficence of the Almighty, involves us in hardly any real moral difficulties."

+

MR. W. L. CARPENTER'S 'ENERGY IN NATURE.'†

WE do not know of any book which deserves to be more strongly recommended than this to those who, without having necessarily had any special training in physical science, are intelligently interested in the great discoveries which have revealed the mutual relations of the Forces of Nature, and which illustrate in so many striking and impressive ways the unity in variety and variety in unity which exist throughout the natural universe. Mr. Carpenter has

* *Evolution and Natural Theology*. By W. F. Kirby, of the British Museum. London: Sonnenschein. 1883.

† *Energy in Nature*; being, with some additions, the substance of a Course of Six Lectures upon the Forces of Nature and their Relations. By WM. LANT CARPENTER, B.A., B.Sc. London: Cassell. 1883.

had a large experience in explaining these things to popular audiences, and for the special method of the book before us it is an advantage that it should have grown out of the unwritten addresses and public demonstrations which had been found by experience to be the most effective. Mr. Carpenter has avoided technical scientific terms as far as possible, and has given the preference to the most simple and direct illustrations; and he has skilfully made all the interesting details of each branch of his subject lead up to the grand generalisations of science, and a wide outlook over the whole field that comes within the range of observation and theory. The book is brought well up to date, and we may note especially some of the latest practical applications of electricity, which so strikingly illustrate the transformation of force and the conservation of energy, and reveal the unity of law throughout nature. The book is admirably got up and is illustrated with more than eighty woodcuts of experiments, apparatus, &c. It ought to prove very popular in its present form, and we hope it will not be long before it reappears in a still cheaper edition, for the special benefit of the working men, in whose interest the lectures were originally devised, but whose privilege we are now allowed to share.

AN INDICTMENT OF THE LUNACY LAWS.*

MRS. LOWE has penned an unsparing, and, as some will judge, an indiscriminating indictment of our whole system of dealing with lunatics. She has been deeply impressed by the cases of cruelty and injustice with which she herself is acquainted, and she believes that the facilities for arbitrarily shutting up any person, however sane he may be, are fearfully great. It needs, perhaps, in some cases, an extreme and sensational statement in order to arouse attention to a real danger; and we do not doubt that for much of what Mrs. Lowe alleges to have been done, or to be possible, she may have good and verifiable evidence. We cannot, however, help feeling that her horror of the whole system, and her remembrance of injuries which, it would appear, she has herself either sustained or witnessed, predisposes her to believe the worst in every case she hears of. She hardly writes in a judicial spirit, and though the evidence, whatever it may be, in each case has been sufficient to convince her of the fact of all the injustice and cruelty she reports, she certainly does not inspire us with implicit confidence in all her statements. It is enough, perhaps, that she should rouse and startle the easy-going optimists into a sense of the dangers which undoubtedly exist under the present law in spite of the immense reforms which have been effected; and she proves the physical impossibility that the existing machinery of administration can ever adequately provide against unjust incarceration, or can speedily remedy one of the most terrible of wrongs. A certificate of lunacy is obtainable with fatal facility, and though an

* *The Bastilles of England; or, the Lunacy Laws at Work.* By LOUISE LOWE. Vol. I. London: Crookenden. 1883.

elaborate and apparently thorough-going and far-reaching system has been contrived for the regulation and inspection of asylums, and the Lunacy Commission and Visitors of Lunatics have ample powers, it is easy to show the impossibility of their difficult and delicate duties being adequately performed, even if, as appears not to be the case, the Commissioners and other officials were required to give the whole of their professional time to the duties of their post. On these points, and on many others relating to the management and inspection of asylums, Mrs. Lowe has a good deal to say that requires the most serious consideration. She only prejudices her cause when she makes wild and incredible charges of corruption against individual Commissioners. She quotes with approval the remark of an American lady on the English lunacy system, that "the Commissioners in Lunacy drive a profitable trade with the superintendents and madness-mongers, by allowing them to incarcerate sane persons or detain patients after recovery." And she thinks that when she cannot account in any other way for what she considers their sins of omission or commission, she is justified in concluding that they have acted from a corrupt motive, and have connived at a crime either to oblige a friend or patron, or to put money in their purse. There are other things in the book, partly wrong and partly foolish, which will prevent its more serious and authentic statements from being attended to as they deserve. The whole subject requires treating more dispassionately and with more sober judgment. A reviewer, not long ago, said that there was now absolutely no danger of any one being unjustly consigned to a lunatic asylum. The truth, we think, lies somewhere between the complacent optimism of such a belief, and the pessimism of Mrs. Lowe, who is convinced that no one is safe under the lunacy laws as at present administered if it is to the interest of any sufficiently wicked person that he should be put out of the way.

THIRTY THOUSAND THOUGHTS.*

THIS portly volume, containing 3,129 "thoughts," is to be followed, it appears, by five more of the same proportions, a gigantic undertaking, on which an enormous amount of time, labour, and ingenuity of arrangement and classification will be spent, and, so far as we may judge from this opening instalment, a good deal of it will be spent to very little useful purpose, and some of it to positively mischievous ends. The extracts, we are told on the title-page, are "gathered from the best available sources, of all ages and all schools of thought, with suggestive and seminal headings and homiletical and illuminative framework; the whole arranged upon a scientific basis. With classified and thought-multiplying (!) lists, comparative tables, and elaborate indices, alphabetical,

* *Thirty Thousand Thoughts*, being extracts covering a comprehensive circle of allied topics. Edited by Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, Rev. J. S. Exell, Rev. C. Neil. With introduction by the Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. London: Kegan Paul. 1884.

topical, textual, and scriptural." All this amassed material and elaborate apparatus is to form a "homiletical cyclopædia on a truly comprehensive basis," providing "readier modes to arrive at knowledge in departments necessary for occasional and immediate use, or for popular embellishment." It is possible that a comprehensive collection of well-chosen passages, arranged and edited with adequate knowledge and breadth of view and literary skill and judgment, might be of use to preachers as suggesting new and fruitful lines of reflection, and giving some idea of the phases of thought and faith which have appeared in the teachings of the best representatives of different schools of religious and philosophical thought; and it might have furnished occasionally some grateful variety in the spiritual diet dispensed from the pulpit. But we feel bound to say, after carefully going through every section in this pretentious volume, our feeling is mainly one of astonishment that the combined labours of three editors, with a large company of workers gathering material for them in all directions, should have resulted in a work which contains so little real "light and leading" on the subjects of most pressing moment in the controversies which concern the social and religious life to-day. It would hardly be possible for any compiler, however dull, to miss a large number of true and suggestive passages, bearing especially on practical religion and the conduct of life, which will bear quotation, and may come in conveniently in a sermon. Such "homiletic" extracts here presented from the elder divines or from later preachers and writers are numerous; and if they are apt to degenerate into the common-place or the merely rhetorical, they are, at any rate, not below the average level of pulpit oratory, and are often a good way above it. But when we come to the representations which have been deliberately singled out for approval by the editors, of some of the questions of doctrine, religious, philosophical, social, which most agitate to-day the mind of the churches, and to which the Dean of Chester in his commendatory Preface specially calls attention—questions which have a direct relation to the most urgent problems of faith and life, and concerning some of which the traditions of orthodoxy and current ways of thinking and believing have of late been especially put on their defence, there is a lamentable want of insight and comprehension, an evasion (or ignorance) of the real points at issue, and a miserably contracted range of thought, which are truly surprising. The subject of "The Christian Evidences," which occupies more than half the volume, is treated from the most antiquated point of view. A strict and formal dogmatic scheme is set up and hedged in with all the defences of external evidence of Prophecy, Miracle, and the testimony of History, and this is followed up by a review of the "Forces opposed to Christianity," viz., Infidelity, Non-Christian Systems, and Heresies. Among the forces under the first of these heads are Theism, Monotheism, Unitarianism, Intuitionism, Evolutionism, Socialism. The extracts by which they are "illustrated" are some of them almost incredibly empty of sense, while others are full of the most flagrantly unfair and ignorant misrepresentation. Mr. Brewin Grant, whose numerous contributions with the signature

B. G. will perhaps bear off the palm for absolute dulness or utter incapacity to deal seriously with a single serious problem of thought, gives in a few sentences the most foolish caricature of the doctrine of *Evolution* that we have ever come across. *Unitarianism* is dismissed with one "thought," also by *B. G.*, the chief point of which is that "as to the word" it is Monotheism; that it ranges from rationalism, neology, deism to the very verge of orthodox evangelical religion, and includes Dr. Priestly [*sic*] and James Martineau; and that "it is not opposed to Trinitarianism in its etymological force," "Tri-unity being the etymology of Trinity." On *Socialism* (concerning which a preacher in these latest days might certainly look for some guidance in a homiletic cyclopædia) there are five short articles, occupying just one single column—two by *B. G.* and three from the *Christian Examiner*. Mr. Grant contents himself mainly with holding up Robert Owen to obloquy, remarking that his lectures on marriage "set up animals as our true models, and perhaps he sunk below them in some of his teachings;" and the *Christian Examiner* is adduced as testifying that "Socialism is not favourable to the true life of man," for it says "The whole doctrine of the desirableness of luxury which lies at the basis of the 'phalanstery' seems to us very questionable. . . . While in this world we cannot so entirely repudiate the self-denial of the cross, nor do we think it well to tell men striving for their daily bread, and cheered by hopes of reasonable success, that they ought to feast better than kings and revel in every indulgence, and with less should not be content." It is fairly open to discussion how far the theories and the different schemes of Socialism in its many phases, are in accord with the Christian idea, are opposed to it, or are independent of it; but when the momentous questions connected with the whole subject are being taken so deeply to heart, and are discussed far and wide by statesmen, philanthropists, and religious teachers, and the spirit of reform, if not of revolution, is evoked under the name of Socialism, Christian or extra-Christian, it is simply monstrous to dismiss the subject in these few false and stupid sentences. Again, if there is one theological controversy which more than any other has of late stirred up the deep and earnest feeling of religious men in different churches, it is the controversy about the nature and duration of future punishment; and the doctrines which go generally under the name of *Universalism* have in more or less modified forms received the suffrage of the mind and conscience of the Churches liberated from the bondage to a hard and cruel creed. We soon see that it is natural for the editors to reckon *Universalism* amongst the hostile forces arrayed against the dogmatic system here labelled "Christianity," which their contributors are all retained to defend. But few readers with any acquaintance, however slight, with the literature of the subject, would be prepared for the section devoted to it in this collection of laboriously-collected and thrice-sifted "thoughts." Eight columns are filled almost entirely with extracts taken or condensed from the *Biblical Repository*, the whole drift of which is to represent the Universalists as teaching that the consequences

of sin are confined entirely to this life, and that a man steeped in vice and dying in the heyday of his wickedness, is straightway transferred to a heaven of absolute blessedness, which would be "a serious miscarriage of justice." This world, we are informed on the same authority, is represented by Universalism as "one vast prison-house or hell," and the next as "a universal paradise," and we are called upon to note the inconsistency of men who hold this view and yet "evince no eagerness to leave a world where the sins of men are rigorously punished." Is it possible that three clergymen, presumably acquainted at least with the elements of modern Christian dogmatics, can have deliberately selected and passed such stuff as this in their search for "first-class illustrations and really superior extracts"? It would require far more space than we can afford to give but a small proportion of the instances we have noted of the editor's incompetence to give a fair representation, or one that is not ludicrously inadequate, of any subject that lies outside the range of their own narrow dogmatic schemes. "Atheism," we are told, in an extract from Dr. Le Jeune, "is less base than pantheism;" "it is better to deny than to degrade God;" to which *B. G.* adds the remark, *a propos* of Positivism, "that it may be doubted whether ignoring is not meaner than denying, and if not in itself more offensive, it is at least 'without the courage of its convictions.'" Under the head of *Transcendentalism* are some long extracts from the *Church Review* and the *Christian Examiner*, the latter undertaking to show its effects on Sociology, viz. (1) "It destroys the finer and friendly feelings between rival schools of speculative thought," and (2) "It alienates practical men by arrogantly ignoring their intelligence;" and from the same source is drawn an argument that "the system leads inevitably to atheism." When engaged on illustrations of *Scepticism*, the editors give us a whole column from "that powerful and eloquent lecturer, the Rev. Joseph Cook," who tells his Boston audience, amongst other things, "Theodore Parker is the best sceptic you ever had; but to me he is honeycombed through and through with disloyalty to the very nature of things—his supreme authority." *Speculative Philosophy* is disposed of mainly under the head of Failure under Crucial Tests. Feuerbach, we are told, "expired in utter bewilderment and confusion, saying: 'Truth! O truth! where is it?' and with this confession of despair on his lips passed into eternity." "Goethe's last words were: 'Light! oh for more light!'" Of what avail was it now that he had been the idol of the literary world. Instead of light there was the blackness of darkness." "Richard Brinsley Sheridan [a curious type of a speculative philosopher!] shrieked: 'O, I am absolutely undone!'" We should hope few preachers, however bent on edification at all hazards, will accept these "homiletic illustrations," or will imitate the vulgar attempt at smartness with which *B. G.* winds up the subject: "Speculative philosophy, like a 'speculative' business, affords more blanks than prizes, and abounds in risks, but not in satisfactory results." Concerning *Heresy* (generally) we learn that "Self-will, obstinacy, dogmatism, enter into the radical idea of a heretic, and help to give him that character." "Modern heresy

consists not in refusing to believe what has been believed, but in daring to believe more than has been believed." With regard to the special heresies that are described and criticised, we should have thought the editors might have been satisfied with directing their readers to some standard ecclesiastical history. At any rate they might have gone to one themselves for information instead of searching for it in the *Boston Review*, the *Church Review*, the *Baptist Quarterly*, and other anonymous sources; nor need they have availed themselves so often of "B. G.'s" readiness to rush in anywhere with a "thought" at a moment's notice.

The Dean of Chester in his introduction, while he does not of course pledge himself to agreement with all that is in the book, cannot doubt, he says, "that the gathering together of a large number of various utterances on this serious subject (the Evidences of Christianity) will be helpful to many doubting minds." He also says that Christianity, as the ages pass on, "must enter into new modes of conflict with the world, and must adopt new modes of persuasion." This is very true; but we can only say that we have found, in those subjects illustrated in this book, which required the most scrupulously careful consideration, and the most candid and intelligent exposition, an entire incapacity on the part of the compilers to give any help or throw any new light except a misleading one on the problems they have undertaken to deal with. As to their profession of having taken their extracts from "all schools of thought," it is in a certain sense justified. We find, for instance, besides the usual array of orthodox names of various note, or of no note at all, those of Channing and Martineau, Miss Cobbe, Carlyle, J. S. Mill, and other representatives of some of the "forces opposed to Christianity." But we doubt whether the heretics and latitudinarians all put together would have more than half a dozen pages for their share; and they are never called in, to give an authentic representation of their own characteristic views, which it suits the plan of the editors to slur over or to caricature in some other part of the book. Dr. Martineau is allowed to testify, in two or three detached sentences, against the materialistic philosophy, and Miss Cobbe against the possibility of an atheistic morality. The one solitary passage we have discovered from Dr. Channing, on the individuality and indestructibility of the mind of man, is placed in the section on "The Distinctive Doctrines of Christianity," and ingeniously classed under the heading "The Personal Agency of the Holy Ghost." We have to search carefully to find the name of any pronounced Broad-Church writer, and Roman Catholic divines are chiefly conspicuous by their absence. But we cannot go into any further criticism of the book. It would not have been worth while saying as much as we have done about it if it had been put forth with less extensive claims, or had been planned on a more modest scale. But a "Homiletical Cyclopædia," in six huge volumes, is, we may suppose, intended to be used as a perennial source of information and illustration; and whatever may be its use to the maker of sermons when it does not go beyond the common ground of practical religion and morals, we are sorry to say that in the case of almost all the subjects which required the most careful treatment and in which an earnest

preacher might look most anxiously for help from other thinkers, there is little to be found but "a darkening of counsel by words without knowledge."

✱ PROFESSOR UPTON ON THE NATURAL EVOLUTION OF MIND. *

AN adequate statement and examination of Mr. Upton's argument would require at least as long a treatise as the address itself, and we cannot do more than commend it to our readers as a very clear and powerful exposition, from the point of view of a spiritual philosophy, of the objections to the doctrine that the mind of man is a product of the same evolutionary processes which are discovered in physical nature. There is so much loose thinking and vague feeling on this subject, and such a tendency to submit to the dictation of anything that arrogates to itself the name of "science," that a distinct presentation of the real issues of the doctrine of the physical genesis of mind, cannot but be of great service; and those who may not be persuaded to accept Mr. Upton's will at least be helped by him to realise better what their own is.

PULPIT COMMENTARY ON I. CORINTHIANS,†

THE primary and all-inclusive fault of the Pulpit Commentary is its existence at all. We have no belief in any good results to be obtained by the process of sermon manufacture for which it is intended to provide the method and the material. Here is one of St. Paul's pastoral letters which would fill about ten pages of the book. It is first expounded, with commendable conciseness and with the knowledge and sympathy which we should expect of Archdeacon Farrar; and then it is all worked up for the benefit of the sermon maker. "Homiletics" and "Homilies," expand, amplify, improve and apply it chapter by chapter and verse by verse, each of the seven homilists in turn giving a condensed sermon, or the skeleton of one, on every verse or series of verses, till nothing else can be further extracted from it, or put into it. If the work was to be done at all the various writers have fulfilled their task in an exemplary manner: and we should be sorry to say that such earnest, religious men and good preachers, as we know some of the editors are, and doubt not that all are, have not much that is true and wise and helpful to say in the 575 large, closely printed pages that they have filled. But we feel very strongly that a minister who takes St. Paul's words for

* *An Examination of the Doctrine of the Natural Evolution of Mind; or, the Distinctive Features of Scientific and Spiritual Knowledge.* An address delivered in Manchester New College, London. By CHARLES B. UPTON, B.A., B.Sc. Prof. of Mental and Moral Philosophy. London: Williams and Norgate. 1883.

† The Pulpit Commentary. *I. Corinthians.* Exposition by the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D.; Homiletics, Rev. David Thomas, D.D.; Homilies by Rev. D. Fraser, D.D., Rev. Ex-Chancellor Lipscomb, LL.D., Rev. E. Hurndall, Rev. J. R. Thomson, Rev. R. Tuck, Rev. J. Waite, Rev. H. Bremner. London: Kegan Paul. 1883.

his text would fare much better if he went direct to the apostle for his inspiration, and did not expect to find his sermon more than half made for him, at a good many removes from the original source. Some good exegetical commentaries, by competent scholars, on the different books of the Bible; and, for study both of style and matter, a few choice volumes of sermons by the classic divines, or by the leaders of religious thought in the churches to-day, would be better worth a place on the shelves of a minister's library, and would be a far better guide and help to him in his pulpit duties, than would this great storehouse of raw material for sermons. If we may calculate from what has already been published, the Pulpit Commentary on the whole Bible will fill not less than fifty volumes, containing some twenty-five thousand pages, or twenty million words, and even if every word were a word of wisdom we should feel that there were millions too many.

IN TROUBLED TIMES.*

THE Dutch literature with which this Review has been most concerned is the literature of Dutch theology; and a novel, even by the daughter of a professor at Amsterdam, may be considered to lie somewhat outside our ordinary range. We cannot, however, deny ourselves the satisfaction of saying in a few words with what pleasure and interest we have read *In Troubled Times*, and adding one more to the many expressions of critical approval with which "Wallis's" book has been already received by the English readers to whom Miss Irving has introduced it by her translation. *In Troubled Times* is a historical novel, the scene of which is laid in the Netherlands, in the earlier years of the great revolt, with the tragic events of which the principal personages in the story are more or less directly connected. The characters are drawn with sympathy and insight; and the tragedy of their lives is in artistic keeping with the mightier drama that was being acted, both the history and the fiction being so presented as to give a vivid impression of the religious and political forces which were at work in that determined and heroic struggle for freedom. The style of the book is dignified and serious. It would have been improved sometimes by a little condensation, the descriptions and analysis of character, &c., being apt occasionally to extend to a length, unnecessarily delaying the movement of the story. Of course, the literary quality of the original loses something in its transference to another language. The translation, however, gives us the impression of being a faithful rendering, and with the exception of an occasional stiffness of phrase, it is in good readable English. We hope that the success of *In Dagen von Stryd*, in its English dress, will have been such as to encourage the publishers to give us a translation of "Wallis's" more recent *Vorstengunst*, a story belonging to the later years of Gustavus Vasa and the reign of Eric XIV. of Sweden.

* *In Troubled Times*. By A. S. C. WALLIS. Translated from the Dutch by E. J. Irving. 3 vols. London: Sonnenschein. 1883.

MR. TYLER ON THE MYSTERY OF BEING.*

MR TYLER thinks that "there is in this age a too general tendency to regard the question of life, and the nature and attributes of man, as also the insoluble problems relating to the universe generally, with a cool indifference." We should have said on the contrary, that the tendency was to take a great deal of more or less intelligent interest in these questions, and the attempts to answer them, or to decide whether the problems are soluble or insoluble form a noticeable feature in the theological and philosophical literature of the day. Mr. Tyler's own contribution to this literature has no marked features of originality, but it is often suggestive, and his arguments are clearly and sincerely put though we cannot say they are very forcible in their application. A chief point is that we can observe *how* an event happens, how a law prevails what qualities a thing possesses—but while we know the "how" we do not know the "why," and beyond all observed phenomena there is the mystery of the great first cause.

HEROES OF ISRAEL.†

MR. BARTRAM in his third series of "Bible Stories" tells of Joshua and of Samson, of Samuel and Saul and David, and he includes in it also the beautiful idyll of Ruth. While showing that he is acquainted with the results of modern criticism, and profiting by its constructive work, he does not assume an over-critical attitude; and he takes care not to translate the old-world ideas into the modern idiom either of language or of thought, and so to spoil the picturesqueness and poetry of the ancient stories. At the same time he does not slur over the things which would trouble the conscience of his young readers, and while helping them to enjoy the story for its own sake, helps them also to point the moral.

The following books are reserved for later notice:—*The Book of Job*. A new translation, &c. By G. H. B. WRIGHT. (Williams and Norgate.) *Hus und Wiclif*. By Prof. LOSERTH. (Leipzig: Freytag.) *Christian History. Modern Phases*. By J. H. ALLEN. (Boston: Roberts.) *Ten Great Religions*. By J. FREEMAN CLARKE. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co.) *Creeeds of the Day*. By HENRY COKE. (Trübner.) *Sermons preached in Clifton College Chapel*. By Rev. J. M. WILSON. (Macmillan.)

* *The Mystery of Being; or, What do we Know?* By J. TYLER, M.L.L.S. London: Kegan Paul. 1883.

† *Heroes of Israel*. By RICHARD BARTRAM. London: Sunday School Association, 37, Norfolk-street, Strand. 1883.